Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Design Report 2018–2020

IRM Staff, with contributions from Sungsoo Hwang

Table of Contents

Open
Government
Partnership

Executive Summary: South Korea

South Korea's fourth action plan includes a diverse range of commitments, with particular focus on open data, access to information, and citizen engagement. While the Open Government Forum Korea played a pivotal role in developing the action plan, there is an opportunity for citizens and civil society to better influence the selection of commitments and, in doing so, lead the inclusion of more ambitious initiatives.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments follow through on commitments. South Korea joined OGP in 2011. Since, South Korea has implemented three action plans. This report evaluates the design of South Korea's fourth action plan.

General overview of action plan

South Korea's fourth action plan aims to leverage the OGP platform to address a number of issues aligned with key domestic priorities, including reforms encapsulated in the government's five-year plan. In particular, it seeks to respond to citizen calls for improved public engagement in decision-making. This is strongly reflected in the inclusion of commitments on the use of online and offline citizen engagement platforms, and endeavors to increase access to information in a number of areas, including the disclosure of information on food safety, local tourism, and cultural heritage resources. The plan also seeks to build on reform initiatives included in previous action plans through commitments on data disclosure and access to public services through technology.

Table 1. At a glance
Participating since: 2011
Action plan under review: 2018–2020
Report type: Design
Number of commitments: 13

Action plan development

Is there a multistakeholder forum: Yes
Level of public influence: Collaborate
Acted contrary to OGP process: No

Action plan design

Commitments relevant to OGP values: 13 (100%)
Transformative commitments: 0 (0%)
Potentially starred commitments: 0

The Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS) led and coordinated the OGP process in the country, this time alongside the multistakeholder Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK). Compared to previous action plan cycles, the operation of the OGFK contributed to better efforts to raise public awareness and ensured a more balanced representation of government and civil society stakeholders in the OGP process. The OGFK called for commitment proposals, convened multistakeholder consultation workshops, and defined commitment selection criteria. Through an open call via the OGFK's online platform, the forum received 67 commitment proposals from government agencies, civil society, and citizens. The OGFK hosted four selection meetings and two consultations to shortlist the proposals and facilitated a multistakeholder workshop to select the final 13 commitments included in the action plan.

The strong involvement of civil society in the OGFK and its conduct of iterative consultations characterized a collaborative process where civil society and citizens were able to help set the OGP agenda in South Korea. The MOIS and other government agencies largely played the role of facilitator and provided a platform for discussion. However, introducing opportunities for remote participation and utilizing additional platforms and channels for stakeholder engagement would increase participation of an even wider group of stakeholders. Similarly, including more diverse civil society groups in the OGFK could also allow discussions to expand beyond primarily Seoul-based,[1] professional nongovernmental organizations already working in areas relevant to open government.

Out of the final 13 commitments, three are based on proposals from civil society and public consultations. The remaining ten were initiated by seven different government agencies. While proposals initiated by government may have implicitly received civil society endorsement, these numbers suggest a future opportunity for citizens and civil society priorities to better influence the selection criteria of final commitments. The MOIS published broad criteria for the selection of commitments online and engaged in an iterative review process with the OGFK. However, the MOIS did not publish reasoned responses behind key decisions, including justifications for commitment proposals not adopted.

The selected commitments range from promoting open data and increasing access to information, to strengthening government transparency and facilitating citizen participation in decision-making. Unlike previous action plans, all commitments included in this plan are relevant to OGP values and all of them are verifiable. This time, the IRM also assesses that five commitments (Commitments 1, 4, 6, 10, and 11) stand to have moderate potential impact and, if fully implemented, are likely to contribute to notable improvements in the status-quo of their respective policy areas. The ambition of these commitments can be stretched further with clearer expression of the nature and scope of related activities. However, as several commitments continue to narrowly build on existing initiatives or contain activities and milestones with limited clarity of scope, the IRM assesses that the majority of commitments would have minor potential impact on their respective issues.

Table 2. Noteworthy commitments

Commitment description	Moving forward	Status at the end of the implementation cycle.
10. Disclosure of the nation's Priority Data Expand ongoing efforts in public data disclosure to include areas such as the environment, health and safety, and new technologies.	The Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of the Interior and Safety could continue to develop and expand efforts around public disclosure of high-value datasets, utilizing online and offline channels to identify public priorities and raise awareness on the availability of such data.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*
11. Enhance Quality Management of Public Data Produce higher quality public data and increase the usage of such data by citizens and businesses.	The Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of the Interior and Safety, with the support of civil society, could also provide training and guidelines on ways in which data can be leveraged to inform or influence decision-making.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*

5-2. Open Communication Forum "Gwanghwamoon 1st street"	The Public Participation Innovation Division at the Ministry of the Interior and Safety could consider developing more verifiable indicators and milestones to determine the extent to which the forum contributes to policy impact. The government could also improve the function of the forum by documenting, analyzing, and publishing its activities, and institutionalizing it through legislation.	*Note: this will be assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*
Expand the online and offline public participation forum to increase citizen participation and input in decision-making.		

Recommendations

IRM recommendations aim to inform the development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. Please refer to Section V: General Recommendations for more details on each of the below recommendations.

Table 3. Five KEY IRM Recommendations

Broaden and deepen public participation in the OGP process through proactive communication, wider consultations, and enhanced citizen engagement.
Design ambitious, relevant, and specific commitments in policy areas aligned with South Korea's OGP Steering Committee Co-Chair priorities.
Expand the scope and ambition of open data initiatives through stronger collaboration with citizens and civil society.
Consolidate public participation in the budget process by reinforcing existing participatory platforms and mechanisms.
Promote whistleblowing and combat corruption by strengthening and increasing public awareness of whistleblower protections and entitlements

ABOUT THE IRM

OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses the development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability. Sungsoo Hwang collaborated with the IRM to conduct desk research and interviews to inform the findings in this report.

Open
Government
Partnership

---

[1] The OGFK member representing the Korea Association for Local Government and Administration is based outside Seoul.

I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership is a global partnership that brings together government reformers and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, responsive, and accountable. Action plan commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) monitors all action plans to ensure governments complete commitments. Civil society and government leaders use the evaluations to reflect on their own progress and determine if actions have made an impact on people's lives.

South Korea joined OGP in 2011. This report covers the development and design of South Korea's fourth action plan for 2018−2020.

The Independent Reporting Mechanism of OGP has partnered with Sungsoo Hwang, Yeungnam University, to conduct this evaluation. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. For a full description of the IRM's methodology, please visit https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/independent-reporting-mechanism.

II. Open Government Context in South Korea

South Korea's fourth action plan seeks to build on recent open government reforms in response to persistent citizen calls for improved public engagement in decision-making. The action plan advances access to information and open data commitments and charts new initiatives focused on civic participation and anticorruption.

2.1 Background

South Korea continues to rank well on a variety of good governance indicators and leads among OECD peers on open data initiatives.[1] Since becoming a member of OGP in 2011, South Korea has consistently met OGP's eligibility criteria (budget transparency, access to information, asset declaration, and citizen engagement).

South Korea's previous action plans addressed issues aligned with domestic priorities and OGP values, including data disclosure, civic participation, financial transparency, and improved access to public services through technology. The fourth action plan (2018−2020) continues to address some of these important themes. It also introduces several new commitments, notably focused on civic participation and anticorruption. Commitments 4 and 7 expand access to information on food and drug safety to enhance transparency around the production of consumer goods. Although domestically important, the action plan does not include commitments to improve the freedom of expression and assembly, reform opaque governance structures at large family-owned industrial conglomerates (*chaebols*) or introduce legislative reform to facilitate access to information or budget transparency.

Open Government Reform Agenda

In 2017, South Korea elected Moon Jae-In as their new president following the impeachment of President Park Geun-Hye on charges of corruption. The Moon administration began their term in the context of a growing citizen movement to reestablish democracy and rule of law.[2] Citizens' confidence in their national government was below the OECD average in 2016, highlighting the need for public sector reform.[3]

In 2018, the Moon administration launched a Government Innovation Strategy[4] to restore public confidence and fulfill broader open government commitments within a five-year policy agenda.[5] The strategy lays out core projects for government innovation to realize a "government of the people." Multiple projects expand on previous OGP commitments on civic participation, including public data disclosure, integrated public service portals, and the operation of online and offline "Gwanghwamoon First Street" public discussions on policy.[6]

The Moon administration published a series of good governance "best practices" in the years leading up to this action plan. These include a public ethics system for asset declarations and a consolidated web portal for administrative services.[7] The administration's recent strategic initiatives may have contributed to a general increase in public confidence in government. Although the percentage of citizens' confident in public services remains below the OECD average, it has improved from 24% in 2016[8] to 39% in 2018.[9]

This increase in public confidence was also reflected in the 2020 national assembly elections, where President Moon's Democratic Party won 180 of the 300 seats, an increase of 60 seats.[10] This result represents the biggest majority in the assembly since 1987. Despite voting in the midst of the COVID-19 outbreak, 66.2% of eligible voters cast a ballot, more than in any parliamentary election since 1992. Although this election took place after the development of this action plan, its result reinforces the mandate for the Moon administration to continue implementing an ambitious policy agenda, centered around a "government of the people," and a commitment to open government.

Access to Information and Open Data

The Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies protects the right of citizens to access public information in South Korea.[11] The Act applies to an extensive range of public institutions, including state agencies, the National Assembly, local governments, and central administrative agencies, and outline clear procedures for citizens to request information, and for public officials to respond to such requests. The exceptions to the right of access to information, such as for purposes of national security, are consistent with international standards. In September 2018, the Global Right to Information Rating scored this law 97 out of 150,[12] highlighting possible opportunity to strengthen the mandatory public interest override, even where the disclosure of information may "seriously undermine the legitimate interests of corporations".[13]

While South Korea has not made any recent legislative reforms in this policy area, the third OGP action plan included several related commitments.[14] Under the previous action plan, the government expanded the Integrated Information Disclosure System to include information from private universities and added information on government practices to the Open Information Portal. The government also improved the standardization of information disclosure across agencies, including local and regional governments. The current action plan also strives to improve access to information through commitments that, for instance, aim to disclose high priority public data (Commitment 10) and strengthen the system for disclosing the names and information of public officials responsible for policy decisions (Commitment 3).

South Korea has established itself as an OECD leader in open data on OECD's Open-Useful-Reusable Government Index (OURdata).[15] This is attributable to formal requirements and sustained government support to open data at the highest level. According to the Open Data Barometer (ODB), South Korea has steadily improved on open data criteria, including an improvement of its OBD score from 62 in 2017 to 72 in 2018.[16] The Barometer ranks the country among the leaders in open data.

Consistent with such leadership, South Korea made strong progress on a number of open data commitments in the previous OGP action plan.[17] For example, the government disclosed over 22,000 datasets on topics ranging from regional financial data to food waste data through its Open Data Portal and completed quality control and evaluation of 21 high-capacity public datasets. The current action plan continues this focus on open data with commitments to improve access to data on performance venues (Commitment 2), share data on culture and tourism (Commitment 8), and disclose more high-utility, high-demand data (Commitment 10). Commitment 11 focuses on collecting public opinion to improve the quality management of public data.

Civil Liberties

According to Freedom in the World 2019, an annual report published by Freedom House,[18] South Korea has an aggregate score of 83, where 0 represents a score that is "least free" and 100 is "most free." The report indicates the government generally respects personal freedoms but could improve on protecting the rights of minorities and social integration. It also notes that the freedom of assembly is generally facilitated, but tensions have sometimes arisen between police and protestors leading to arrests at protests. In the past, citizens have actively protested on issues ranging from the use of hidden cameras to demands for stronger labor protections.[19] The issuance of permits for protests has increased under the Moon administration.

While South Korea is generally recognized as having a free press and lively civil society, a number of international human rights group have reported specific concerns around the freedom of expression. Human Rights Watch, for instance, reported that limitations to the freedom of expression continued to be a problem in 2018, with the government and large corporations (*chaebols*) using laws, including criminal defamation actions, to limit scrutiny of themselves.[20] Article 19 has also called for amending South Korea's defamation laws, citing concerns that the threat of criminal sanction, including imprisonment, undermines the freedom of expression.[21] The Freedom in the World 2019 report also notes that restrictions on pro-North Korean activity impact legitimate political expression, with the National Security Law, for instance, criminalizing the dissemination of anything that can be

classified as North Korean propaganda.[22] While geo-political considerations and complexities remain pertinent, the enforcement of restrictions in this regard have been tempered since the start of inter-Korean engagement in early 2018.[23] The current action plan does not include commitments that explicitly aim to promote the freedom of expression or assembly.

Civic Participation

South Korea has established a number of mechanisms for meaningful civic participation, ranging from traditional public hearings to innovative Citizen Design Groups, introduced under the previous OGP action plan.[24] The government has shown consistent willingness to consult and communicate with various stakeholders, and involve citizens in decision-making processes.[25] For example, the Moon administration has taken steps to introduce and expand an open communication forum to receive citizen ideas, Gwanghwamoon First Street, which they established within the first 50 days of their political term.[26] The government continues to gather citizen input online via "epeople.go.kr" and the president's office online petition platform. These efforts are reflected in South Korea's improvement in the OECD rating for stakeholder engagement in decision-making from 2.54 to 2.89 on a composite index from 0 to 4.[27]

The current action plan's commitments on civic participation fit within the Moon administration's overarching policy agenda. Commitments that promote civic participation include operating a public diplomacy system (Commitment 5.1) and strengthening the online and offline open communication forum, Gwanghwamoon First Street (Commitment 5.2), in line with the Moon administration's commitment to government innovation[28] and the comprehensive 2018 Government Innovation Strategy.[29] Commitment 5.2 responds to previous IRM recommendations[30] to expand the open communication forum.

Budget Transparency

At the time this action plan was cocreated, the International Budget Partnership's 2017 Open Budget Survey noted that South Korea provided the public with limited budget information and opportunities for participation.[31] The country scored 60 out of 100 on budget transparency, 39 out of 100 on public participation, and 85 out of 100 on budget oversight. South Korea has disclosed more budget data in response to commitments under the previous action plan,[32] but assessments conclude that the government did not produce a mid-year review or include macroeconomic information in its pre-budget statement.[33]

Prior to the development of this action plan, South Korea provided few opportunities for citizens to participate and engage in the budget process, including in open legislative sessions. However, in April 2018, South Korea enacted the National Finance Act,[34] which provides a legal basis for government to enhance transparency and citizens' participation in the budgetary process. The Act's Enforcement Decree goes on to elaborate general protocol around such participation, although specific measures in this regard are to be prescribed by the Minister of Strategy and Finance. While these positive reforms,[35] with particular focus on facilitating participation in forming the budget at the executive level, have led to a notable increase in the participation score of the 2019 Open Budget Survey, the country is now presented with an opportunity to consolidate these gains.[36]

Anticorruption and Whistleblower Protection

South Korea's broad legislative framework for addressing public and private sector corruption includes criminal penalties for domestic and foreign bribery; an Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC); codes of conducts for public sector employees; and regulations on public official conflicts of interest, asset declarations, and disclosure.[37] In 2018, South Korea received a rating of 57 out of 100 in Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, ranking 45 out of 180 countries globally, and 9th in the Asia Pacific region on citizen's perceptions of corruption.[38] In 2019, South Korea further improved its score on the Corruption Perceptions Index to 59 out of 100.[39]

Since 2016, following the prosecution of the former Presidents Park Geun-Hye and Lee Myung-bak for corruption,[40] the legislature passed the Improper Solicitation and Graft Act (colloquially known as Kim Young-ran Act), which introduced limits on acceptance of gifts by government officials.[41] However, while the government has generally taken a punitive approach to public sector corruption, previous policies have inadequately addressed corruption in the private sector.[42]

In his election campaign, President Moon promised to implement chaebol reform, in response to increasing public concern with private sector corruption.[43] "Chaebols" are conglomerates of affiliated companies that are usually dominated by wealthy families. While the government has a mixed record on this front, some conglomerates have begun to simplify their corporate structures.[44] Despite this, chaebols continue to dominate small and medium-sized entities and workers have taken to the streets to demand chaebol reform.[45] Although delivering on chaebol reform has been a significant challenge for successive governments, a multi-agency approach, led by the ACRC, could leverage the open government platform to, for instance, advocate for legislation mandating greater transparency and public accountability in corporate governance. In aiming to broadly strengthen public participation in anticorruption efforts, Commitment 1 encourages public-private cooperation in the implementation of anticorruption policies. However, the current action plan does not aim to explicitly address chaebol reform.

South Korea's Act on the Protection of Public Interest Whistleblowers (PPIWA), passed in 2011, is considered one of the world's most comprehensive whistleblower laws.[46] However, as reported by the New York Times, adverse reactions and public stigma attached to whistleblowing, stemming from an often rigidly hierarchical office culture, has previously inhibited effective implementation.[47] Amendments to the PPIWA in 2017 shifted the burden of proof to the person or company subject to whistleblowing and now requires the ACRC to monitor whether people or companies have implemented the ordered protective measures.[48] As a result, the number of corruption and public interest whistleblowing cases reported and handled increased in 2017 and 2018.[49] Although the IRM, through the 2016−2018 progress report, recommended a commitment on whistleblower protections and incentives, the current action plan does not introduce such a commitment.

[1] OECD, *OECD Open, Useful and Re-usable data (OURdata) Index: 2019* (2020), http://www.oecd.org/gov/digital-government/ourdata-index-policy-paper-2020.pdf.

[2] Anna Fifield, "South Korean prosecutors request 30 year sentence for disgraced former president Park" (*Washington Post*, 27 Feb. 2018), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/south-korean-prosecutors-request-30-years-jail-for-disgraced-former-president-park/2018/02/27/24d0c74c-1b5b-11e8-8a2c-1a6665f59e95_story.html.

[3] OECD, *OECD Government at a Glance 2017* "Korea" (2017), https://www.oecd.org/gov/gov-at-a-glance-2017-korea.pdf.

[4] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "Moon Jae-in administration announced 'Comprehensive Action Plan for Governmental Innovation'" (20 Mar. 2018),"http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchDetailViewInc&menuId=020501&confId=62&conConfId=62&conTabId=0&currPageNo=1&boardNum=69405.

[5] Choi He-suk and Shin Hyon-hee, "Moon Jae-In's five-year road map unveiled" (Korea Herald, 19 Jul. 2017), http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20170719000825.

[6] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017* (OGP, 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/South-Korea_Mid-Term_IRM-Report_2016-2018_EN.pdf.

[7] Ministry of the Interior and Safety, "Good Governance Best Practices" (accessed Jul 2020), https://www.mois.go.kr/eng/sub/a03/GoodGovernanceBestPractices/screen.do.

[8] OECD, *OECD Government at a Glance 2017*.

[9] OECD, *OECD Government at a Glance 2019* (2019), https://www.oecd.org/gov/gov-at-a-glance-2019-korea.pdf.

[10] Justin McCurry, "South Korea's ruling party wins election landslide amid coronavirus outbreak" (*The Guardian*, 15 Apr. 2020), https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/16/south-koreas-ruling-party-wins-election-landslide-amid-coronavirus-outbreak.

[11] Government of South Korea, "Official Information Disclosure Act" (6 Aug. 2013), http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=29982&type=part&key=4.

[12] Global Right to Information Rating, "South Korea" (Sept. 2018), https://www.rti-rating.org/country-detail/?country=South%20Korea.

[13] Article 9(1)(7), Government of South Korea, "Official Information Disclosure Act" (6 Aug. 2013), http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=29982&type=part&key=4.

[14] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017*.

[15] OECD, *OECD Open, Useful and Re-usable data (OURdata) Index: 2019*

[16] Open Data Barometer, *Report: From Promise to Progress* (World Wide Web Foundation, Sept. 2018), https://opendatabarometer.org/leadersedition/report/.

[17] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017.*

[18] Freedom House, *Freedom in the World 2019* "South Korea" (2019), https://freedomhouse.org/country/south-korea/freedom-world/2019.

[19] CIVICUS Monitor, "Laws Used to Deny Trade Union Registration and Workers' Right to Join a Union" (6 Feb. 2018), https://monitor.civicus.org/updates/2018/02/06/laws-used-deny-trade-union-registration-and-workers-right-join-union/.

[20] Kenneth Roth, "South Korea, Events of 2018" (Human Rights Watch, 2018)), https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2019/country-chapters/south-korea.

[21] Article 19, "South Korea: Criminal defamation provisions threaten freedom of expression" (10 May, 2018), https://www.article19.org/resources/south-korea-repressive-criminal-defamation-provisions-threaten-freedom-of-expression/.

[22] CIVICUS, "Statement at UN Human Rights Council: Citizen rights in South Korea" (20 Mar. 2018), https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/united-nations/geneva/3109-statement-at-un-human-rights-council-citizen-rights-in-south-korea.

[23] Freedom House, *Freedom in the World 2019* "South Korea."

[24] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017.*

[25] Thomas Kalinowski, Sang-young Rhyu, and Aurel Croissant, *South Korea Report, Sustainable Governance Indicators 2018* (BertelsmannStiftung, 2018), https://www.sgi-network.org/docs/2018/country/SGI2018_South_Korea.pdf.

[26] Sohn JiAe, "Gwanghwamoon first street draws global attention" (KoreaNet, 2 Jun. 2017), http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/policies/view?articleId=146804.

[27] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017.*

[28] Korean Ministry of the Interior and Safety, "Government Innovation" (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.mois.go.kr/eng/sub/a03/GovernmentInnovation/screen.do.

[29] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "Moon Jae-in administration announced 'Comprehensive Action Plan for Governmental Innovation.'"

[30] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017.*

[31] International Budget Partnership, *Open Budget Survey 2017* "South Korea" (2017), https://www.internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/south-korea-open-budget-survey-2017-summary.pdf.

[32] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017.*

[33] International Budget Partnership, *Open Budget Survey 2017* "South Korea"

[34] Article 16, "National Finance Act" (April 2018)

[35] See, for example: Ministry of Strategy and Finance, "*My Budget*" (in Korean), https://www.mybudget.go.kr/

[36] International Budget Partnership, *Open Budget Survey 2019* "South Korea" (2019), https://www.internationalbudget.org/sites/default/files/country-surveys-pdfs/2019/open-budget-survey-south-korea-2019-en.pdf.

[37] GAN Business Anti-Corruption Portal, "South Korea Corruption Report" (May 2017) https://www.ganintegrity.com/portal/country-profiles/south-korea/.

[38] Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index* (2018), https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018.

[39] Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index* (2019), https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2019/results/kor

[40] Benjamin Haas, "Former South Korean president jailed for 15 years for corruption" (*The Guardian*, 5 Oct. 2018), https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/oct/05/south-korean-president-jailed-15-years-corruption-lee-myung-bak.

[41] Choe Sang-Hun, "Anti-Graft Law Stirs Up Wariness Over South Koreans Bearing Gifts" (*New York Times*, 29 Sept. 2016)m https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/world/asia/south-korea-bribery-law.html.

[42] Government of the Republic of Korea, *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018−2020* (Aug. 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-action-plan-2018-2020/.

[43] Financial Times, "South Koreans push for promised chaebol reforms," https://www.ft.com/content/1ff86f26-ee06-11e8-89c8-d36339d835c0.

[44] Reuters, "Two Samsung units to sell group firm's shares, as South Korea targets cross-ownerships," https://www.reuters.com/article/us-samsung-c-t-corp-stake/two-samsung-units-to-sell-group-firms-shares-as-south-korea-targets-cross-ownerships-idUSKCN1M010K

[45] Financial Times, "South Korea hit by strikes over lack of chaebol reform," https://www.ft.com/content/1ff86f26-ee06-11e8-89c8-d36339d835c0

[46] Simon Wolf, Mark Worth, Suelette Dreyfus, A J Brown, "*Breaking the Silence: Strengthens and Weaknesses in G20 Whistleblower Protection Laws*", Blueprint for Free Speech (October 2015), https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2014-09/apo-nid41246.pdf

[47] Choe Sang-Hun, "South Korea's Whistle-blowers Sound Off at Their Own Risk" (*New York Times*, Date), https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/09/business/international/south-korea-whistle-blower-corruption.html.

[48] OECD Working Group on Bribery, *Implementing the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, Phase 4 Report: Korea* (OECD, 13 Dec. 2018),http://www.oecd.org/corruption/anti-bribery/OECD-Korea-Phase-4-Report-ENG.pdf.

[49] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "Protecting and Rewarding Whistleblowers" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=02031607.

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

The Ministry of the Interior and Safety led and coordinated the OGP process, alongside the multistakeholder Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK). The OGFK played a key role in several aspects of action plan development, ranging from early planning and raising awareness to the final selection of commitments. There remains an opportunity, however, for citizens and civil society to better influence the selection of commitments and, in doing so, include more ambitious initiatives.

3.1 Leadership

This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in South Korea.

The Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS) leads and coordinates the OGP process in South Korea, alongside the multistakeholder Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK). Launched in 2017, the OGFK was mandated with the task of monitoring the development and implementation of commitments in South Korea's 2018−2020 OGP action plan.

The MOIS is generally responsible for the coordination of public service, including the provision of support to local governments for administration, finance, and regional development. The Ministry also designs a five-year Government Innovation Strategy, favoring a whole-of-government approach, to prioritize policies and thematic areas for implementation. In accordance with this approach, other ministries and local municipalities enjoy a degree of autonomy in the management and supervision of their administrative affairs. The composition of the OGFK, which included government agencies and civil society representatives, thus promoted intragovernmental coordination around OGP in South Korea.

Executive power in South Korea is exercised by the Cabinet, led by the President. As with previous action plan cycles, the Office of the President was not directly involved in the OGP process, though high-level government representation in the process was ensured through the Vice-Minister of MOIS co-chairing the OGFK and the Minister chairing global activities.

In the 2016-2018 action plan cycle, MOIS expanded its team, with two points of contact, to more effectively coordinate the OGP process. However, human resource challenges persisted into the new action plan cycle. MOIS allocated a dedicated budget to support OGFK activities, which enabled it to lead a process that included modest efforts to raise awareness and facilitate public participation in the development of the action plan.

3.2 Multistakeholder process throughout action plan development

In 2017, OGP adopted the OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards intended to support participation and cocreation by civil society at all stages of the OGP cycle. All OGP-participating countries are expected to meet these standards. The standards aim to raise ambition and quality of participation during development, implementation, and review of OGP action plans.

OGP's Articles of Governance also establish participation and cocreation requirements a country or entity must meet in their action plan development and implementation to act according to OGP process. South Korea **did not act** contrary to OGP process.[1]

Please see Annex I for an overview of South Korea's performance implementing the Co-Creation and Participation Standards throughout the action plan development.

Table 3.2: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) "Spectrum of Participation" to apply to OGP.[2] This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for "collaborate."

Level of public influence		During development of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.	
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.	✓
Involve	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.	
Consult	The public could give inputs.	
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.	
No Consultation	No consultation	

Multistakeholder forum

The Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK) served as the multistakeholder forum in the development of South Korea's fourth OGP action plan. Although the OGFK was mandated with the task of monitoring the development and implementation of OGP commitments, the operation of the OGF did not have an explicit legal basis at the time the action plan was developed.

Formed in response to a recommendation in the previous IRM report,[3] the OGFK consisted of 18 members:[4] seven representing government agencies,[5] and eleven representing civic organizations.[6] The composition of the OGFK reflected a strong focus on ensuring civil society representation and participation in the development of commitments. The organizations represented in the forum are primarily professional nongovernmental organizations working in areas relevant to open government.

Although the OGFK did not publish formal procedures for participation, it adopted a structured approach in the performance of its functions. The OGFK's civil society chair led most meetings and discussions, while MOIS and other government agencies played the role of facilitator and provided a platform for discussion.[7] The OGFK met iteratively during the development of the action plan; including kick-off workshop, four selection meetings, two consultation meetings, and an OGFK meeting to finalize the plan. The forum's meeting minutes, and corresponding decisions, are published online on the websites of the OGFK and the Ministry of the Interior and Safety.[8]

The OGFK played a pivotal role in various aspects of developing the action plan, including efforts to raise awareness and design commitments. For instance, the forum called for commitment proposals, convened consultation workshops, and defined commitment selection criteria.[9] Through the open call for proposals, the OGFK was able to engage stakeholders outside the forum and allow them to inform and influence the development of the action plan. In June 2018, the OGFK convened an inclusive consultation workshop with the participation of ministries, civil society organizations, and individuals who proposed potential commitments. Through such initiatives, civil society and the general public were able to help set the agenda for OGP in South Korea.

Participation and engagement throughout action plan development

The establishment of the OGFK strengthened participation and engagement of stakeholders in the development of South Korea's fourth OGP action plan. Throughout the development of the plan, the OGFK held five meetings to choose, and ensure adherence to, an overall direction, procedure, and schedule. This also entailed the advance provision and publication of press releases with a timeline that identified opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the cocreation process.[10]

In March 2018, MOIS hosted a kick-off event to raise awareness about OGP among a diverse group of 200 stakeholders, including government officers, the legislature, the judiciary, and civil society networks.[11] MOIS issued press releases covering the event and disseminated related information via the OGFK's online platform.[12]

Following the kick-off event, the OGFK circulated an open call for proposals to crowdsource potential commitments, via the forum's online platform. The OGFK received 67 proposals between 15 March and 30 April 2018. Out of these 67 proposals, 36 came from government agencies, 11 were proposed by civil society, and 20 were submitted by individual citizens.

The OGFK led the process of shortlisting and selecting final commitments, which occurred between June and August 2018. To do this, the OGFK hosted four rounds of selection meetings and two consultation workshops, where proposals were shortlisted based on their relevance to open government and redundancy with existing policies.[13] During these selection meetings, the OGFK first narrowed 67 proposals down to 36, and from these, selected 23 final proposals. The OGFK then hosted a workshop to select the 13 commitments that were included in the action plan.

The final commitment selection workshop—again with over 200 participants—was a consultation between the implementing government agencies, civil society, and citizens. Organizing the participants into three thematic working groups, the OGFK's civil society representatives facilitated in-depth discussions around: 1) access to information and open data, 2) citizen participation, and 3) transparency and anticorruption.[14] Although this process was led by civil society experts, the working groups included balanced participation of governmental technical and policy experts.

Building on these discussions, the OGFK's key considerations in adopting the final set of 13 commitments included the ambition of the commitment; the extent to which a commitment was SMART (specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and time-bound); and, critically, the willingness of an implementing agency to take on and implement the commitment. Out of the 13 commitments included in the action plan, nine were initiated through proposals from the government, two emerged from civil society proposals (Commitments 2 and 8), and one originated from public consultations (Commitment 5-2). Although the government did not provide or publish reasoned responses for the omission or inclusion of citizen and civil society proposals on the OGFK website,[15] the government did publish meeting minutes and key decisions, the criteria for selecting commitments, and engaged in an iterative review and commitment selection process with the OGFK.

Cocreation and participation recommendations throughout development
South Korea showed evidence of achievement and strong performance in areas of multistakeholder forum composition and conduct during development of the action plan. For example, the OGFK represented diverse government and civil society stakeholders, many of whom possessed experience in open government topics and themes. The forum was led by civil society and the iterative process of commitment selection provided an opportunity for citizens and stakeholders to influence the process.

Some areas where South Korea can improve are:
- Citizen Priorities: Introducing a process that ensures that ambitious citizen and civil society priorities and proposals are reflected as commitments in the final action plan.
- Raising Awareness: Providing advance notice of opportunities for diverse stakeholders to participate in the cocreation process.
- Remote Participation: Introducing and promoting new opportunities for the remote participation of stakeholders in the cocreation process.
- Reasoned Response: Publishing clear justifications for the exclusion of stakeholder proposals in the action plan.

In order to improve performance in these areas, the IRM suggests that moving forward, the following actions are taken:

- The OGFK could consider restructuring and reframing commitment development and selection workshops to focus on developing and selecting ambitious commitments that not only meet OGP standards of relevance and specificity but are also feasible and aligned with government priorities.
- Although online consultations were held through the OGFK's online platform, stakeholders could enhance the reach and impact of consultations by utilizing existing and long-established platforms for collecting public opinion, such as the Gwanghwamoon First Street platform, People's Voice,[16] or the Blue House Petition.[17]
- In accordance with OGP Participation and Cocreation Standards,[18] consider refining the mandate of the OGFK, providing it with a legal basis, and creating clear rules and procedures of engagement.[19] The forum could meet regularly, have an even balance of government and civil society representatives, and lead the overall OGP process in the country.
- The OGFK could publish and disseminate, sufficiently in advance, key information, dates, and milestones pertaining to action plan development. This may include, for instance, advance notice of public consultations, criteria for the selection of commitments, and reasoned responses for the exclusion or inclusion of commitments in the action plan.

---

[1] Acting Contrary to Process - Country did not meet (1) "involve" during the development or "inform" during implementation of the NAP (2) government fails to collect, publish and document a repository on the national OGP website/webpage in line with IRM guidance.

[2] IAP2, "IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum" (2014), http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf.

[3] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017* (OGP, 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/South-Korea_Mid-Term_IRM-Report_2016-2018_EN.pdf.

[4] Ministry of Public Administration and Security, "대한민국 열린정부 포럼이란?" [Korea Open Government Forum] (27 Mar. 2019), https://www.innogov.go.kr/ucms/bbs/B0000034/view.do?nttId=1264&menuNo=300105&pageIndex=1.

[5] The seven government agencies represented in the Forum are: Ministry of the Interior and Safety, Ministry of Science and ICT, Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, Ministry of Economy and Finance, Ministry of Personnel Management, City of Seoul, and National Information Society Agency.

[6] The 11 civic organizations represented in the Forum are: CODE/Creative Commons Korea, OpenNet, Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation, Right to Know Research Institute Cooperative, Community for Improvement of Information Society Problem, Solidarity for Justice, Open Records Center for Transparency, Korean Association for Local Government Studies, Transparency International Korea, Citizen Action Together, and Citizens' Coalition for Better Government.

[7] IRM Researcher's participant observation of three meeting in 2019, and interview of OGP forum civic organization members.

[8] Ministry of the Interior and Safety, www.mois.gov.kr; Ministry of Public Administration and Security, "대한민국 열린정부 포럼이란?", www.innogov.kr; Civil Society Network, www.ogpkorea.org

[9] Yujin Lee, Government Point of Contact, Ministry of the Interior and Safety, Email with Process-Related Questions and Answers, 28 Apr. 2020.

[10] Ministry of the Interior and Safety, www.mois.gov.kr

[11] *Id.*

[12] Ministry of Public Administration and Security, "대한민국 열린정부 포럼이란?"

[13] Lee, email.

[14] *Id.*

[15] Ministry of Public Administration and Security, "대한민국 열린정부 포럼이란?"

[16] People's voice, a long-time existing online platform for citizen participation can be found here: https://www.vop.co.kr/index.html .

[17] Blue House, Presidential Office, "국민청" [Petition and Citizen Participation] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www1.president.go.kr/petitions.

[18] OGP, "OGP Participation and Co-creation Standards" (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/.
[19] The legal basis for Open Government Forum Korea was enacted in April 2019. This basis includes a description of the forum's function, composition, the responsibilities government and civil society co-chairs, and the frequency of meetings.

IV. Commitments

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's/entity's unique circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP-participating countries.[1] The indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual.[2] A summary of key indicators the IRM assesses is below:

- **Verifiability:**
  - o Not specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, do the objectives stated and actions proposed lack sufficient clarity and specificity for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
  - o Specific enough to verify: As written in the commitment, are the objectives stated and actions proposed sufficiently clear and specific to allow for their completion to be objectively verified through a subsequent assessment process?
- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
  - o Access to Information: Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
  - o Civic Participation: Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions or policies?
  - o Public Accountability: Will the government create or improve public facing opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
  - o Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability: Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?
- **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the *potential impact* of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
  - o Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
  - o Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
  - o Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.
- **Completion:** This variable assesses the commitment's implementation and progress. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *IRM Implementation Report.*
- **Did It Open Government?:** This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice, in areas relevant to OGP values, has changed as a result of the commitment's implementation. This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *IRM Implementation Report.*

What makes a potentially starred commitment?

A potentially starred commitment has more potential to be ambitious and to be implemented. A good commitment is one that clearly describes the:

1. **Problem:** What is the economic, social, political, or environmental problem rather than describing an administrative issue or tool (e.g., "misallocation of welfare funds" is more helpful than "lacking a website")?
2. **Status quo:** What is the status quo of the policy issue at the beginning of an action plan (e.g., "26% of judicial corruption complaints are not processed currently")?

3. **Change:** Rather than stating intermediary outputs, what is the targeted behavior change that is expected from the commitment's implementation (e.g., "doubling response rates to information requests" is a stronger goal than "publishing a protocol for response")?

Starred commitments

One measure, the "starred commitment" (✪), deserves further explanation due to its particular interest to readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top among OGP-participating countries/entities. Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- Potential star: the commitment's design should be **verifiable**, **relevant** to OGP values, and have **transformative** potential impact.
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of **Substantial** or **Complete** implementation.

This variable is assessed at the end of the action plan cycle, in the *Implementation IRM report*.

General Overview of the Commitments

South Korea's 2018−2020 action plan consists of 13 commitments, linked to seven different government agencies. The action plan focuses on promoting open data and access to information, transparency, and citizen participation. Five commitments, such as the disclosure of harmful substance information and open data for culture and tourism, aim to promote open data and access to information. Five commitments, such as the establishment of a public-private committee to combat corruption, aim to facilitate citizen participation and transparency. The remaining three commitments, including strengthening the real-name policy system, are harder to categorize, but may be considered relevant to a number of OGP values.

---

[1] OGP, "Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance" (Jun. 2012 (updated Mar. 2014 and Apr. 2015)), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP_Articles-Gov_Apr-21-2015.pdf.
[2] OGP, "IRM Procedures Manual" (16 Sept. 2017), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

1. Establishing a Public-Private Partnership Anti-Corruption System

Commitment Text:

"Establishment of a Public-Private Partnership Anti-Corruption System"

The purpose of this commitment is to establish a sustainable, anti-corruption governance system with public participation. To do so, a public-private sector cooperation body that reflects the public's opinions in policies and continues to carry out anti-corruption policies should be created and operated; a system that allows the public to participate in anti-corruption policies and communicate should be created; a national campaign for a transparent society should be carried out. In carrying out anticorruption policies, public-private governance and public participation will be actually made possible through implementing this commitment, and the public's appreciation on anti-corruption policies and the level of integrity throughout society will ultimately grow.

The following are specific ways to implement the commitment:

1) A committee for public-private partnership against corruption involving representatives from the public sector, economy, function, civil society, academia and press should be created and participate in the process of proposal, inspection and assessment of anti-corruption policies.

2) 'The public monitor panel for transparent policies' should be created and operated to reexamine comprehensive anti-corruption measures and important measures of each department that have a big impact with the public, from the public's point of view; also, the People's Idea Box, an online platform for policy proposals, should be used to promote the public's participation such as evaluating anti-corruption and transparent policies.

3) 'The Transparent Society Agreement' should be made at all levels of society by function and region so that the transparent culture can be spread.

Milestones:
1.1 Finding anti-corruption policy agenda through a public-private partnership committee for a transparent society
1.2 The public monitoring on transparent policies
1.3 Finding and discussing anti-corruption policies by using the 'People's Idea Box' at all times
1.4 Supporting the signing of the transparent society agreement per function and region and collaborating with relevant parties
1.5 Reflecting the outcome of the public monitoring on transparent initiatives to policies

Start Date: September 1, 2018   **End Date:** To be continued

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
1. Overall		✓		✓					✓		Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to reform the anticorruption system by increasing public participation. This will be achieved through a range of complementary initiatives including the formation of a public-private partnership committee against corruption, the creation of a public monitoring panel to review anticorruption measures, and the signing of a "transparent society agreement" to build a culture of transparency at all levels of society. The government considers anticorruption reform a priority and has included this commitment in its five-year comprehensive anticorruption plan.

The prosecution of former presidents, Park Geun-Hye and Lee Myung-bak, for corruption revealed the existence of corruption in South Korea.[1] In 2018, according to Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, South Korea scored 57 out of 100, reflecting a public perception of moderate levels of corruption in the state sector.[2] This is despite numerous efforts by the government to tackle corruption, including disclosing finances of high-ranking public officials, introducing an anti-graft law, and other anti-corruption policies.

Through this commitment, according to the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC), the multistakeholder committee will be mandated with setting the overall agenda for anticorruption in South Korea and proposing related reforms.[3] According to regulations introduced preceding the formulation of this commitment, the committee will include representatives from government, civil society, media, academia, public interest groups, and the private sector. The public monitoring panel, on the other hand, will comprise of citizen stakeholders with a particular interest in eradicating corruption and promoting integrity. This voluntary, representative group, selected from a pool of applicants by the ACRC, will be regularly consulted by the ACRC on the effectiveness of anticorruption and integrity policies.[4]

Although the establishment of a public-private committee, the creation of a public monitoring panel, and the utilization of the online platform are generally verifiable activities, most of the milestones under this commitment lack specificity. For instance, the roles and purview of the committee and panel are not specified in the commitment text and there is little clarity as to how the government will promote the online platform. The government confirmed, however, that People's Idea Box[5] is an online platform, which has been actively utilized by citizens.[6] The milestones also do not propose an end date and thus largely serve to reflect a broad, yet vague, commitment to anticorruption reform in the country.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as it introduces opportunities for citizens to participate in and inform anticorruption policymaking. These include the establishment of a multistakeholder committee to propose, inspect, and assess anticorruption policies; the operation of the public monitoring panel to monitor and provide feedback on the effectiveness of

such policies; and the utilization of the People's Idea Box,[7] an online platform for citizens to submit policy proposals.

At the time this commitment was designed, the public had limited opportunity to participate meaningfully in shaping or implementing anticorruption policies. According to Transparency International, the channels for citizens and civil society to participate in policy-making processes largely consisted of providing comments or proposals.[8] For instance, the pre-existing People's Idea Box was receiving policy proposals, including those relating to anticorruption.[9] However, it was unclear whether these proposals regularly informed decision-making.

This commitment stands to have moderate potential impact on increasing citizen participation in anticorruption reform. The operation of the multistakeholder committee and the public monitoring panel will build on pre-existing modest citizen participation in anticorruption, by allowing citizens to direct the policy agenda and monitor its implementation.[10] The continued operation, and potential expansion, of the People's Idea Box will supplement these efforts and continue to provide citizens a reliable channel to submit policy proposals for consideration. In addition, the transparent society agreement, although not legally binding, intends to go beyond being a one-time declarative act, to bring together a network of stakeholders committed to combat corruption.[11]

While these initiatives represent important steps forward in strengthening citizen participation in anticorruption efforts, the limited specificity of several milestones inhibits a full assessment of the commitment's potential impact. The limited clarity on the scope of the multistakeholder committee in proposing reforms and on the extent to which the public monitoring panel can influence decision-making, for instance, has direct bearing on whether this commitment will lead to a significant change in the status quo. It is also pertinent to note in this context that some milestones (1.1 - 1.3) included under this commitment were completed prior to its introduction.

Next steps
While this commitment proposes a number of potentially promising measures to increase public participation in anticorruption efforts, a lack of specificity pertaining to the nature and scope of these measures limit a thorough assessment of potential impact.

If this commitment is carried forward in future action plans, the IRM recommends introducing more specific and measurable milestones, with particular focus on initiatives that clearly point to the role of the multistakeholder council and public monitoring panel in influencing decision-making.

---

[1] Benjamin Haas, "Former South Korean president jailed for 15 years for corruption" (*The Guardian,* 5 Oct. 2018), https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/oct/05/south-korean-president-jailed-15-years-corruption-lee-myung-bak.
[2] Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index* (2018), https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018.
[3] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "*Promoting Public-Private Partnership*" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=02031605.
[4] *Id.*
[5] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "e-People (www.epeople.go.kr)" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=020208.
[6] Ministry of the Interior and Safety, "Pre-publication comments on draft South Korea IRM Design Report 2018-2020", Independent Reporting Mechanism, July 2020
[7] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "e-People (www.epeople.go.kr)" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=020208.
[8] Sanghak Lee (Transparency International South Korea), interview by IRM researcher, 3 Jun. 2020.
[9] Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, *ACRC Korea Transparency Newsletter* (17 May 2018), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetailPrint&menuId=020503&boardNum=69734&confId=63.
[10] Lee, interview.
[11] *Id.*

2. Expansion of a Management System of Technical Information for Performance Venues

Commitment Text:

"Expansion of a Management System of Technical Information for Performance Venues"

This commitment is about building a comprehensive management system of technical information for performance venues, providing information such as technical capabilities and floor plans. The purpose of the commitment is to enhance technicality and reliability of technical information offered to performance-venue goers through providing precise and objective technical information based on the outcome of a due diligence on public and private venues and presenting the Korean standard of technical information for theaters according to the international standard. In carrying out the commitment, a data-base providing easy access to all will be expanded, and the services regarding the data will be provided online.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) To expand the current technical information DB available at the website of the KOCACA (as of August 2018, 26 theater installations and floor maps of 70 venues are provided); to update the current DB with additional information including the purchasing route and price of theater installations and the maintenance status;

2) Public performance venues should provide general information through their website and technical information via the integrated management system.

Milestones:

2.1 Establishing a technical information investigation system; conducting preliminary investigations on performance venues; carrying out fact-finding missions on performance venues and interviews.
2.2 Collecting and sorting out technical information for the DB
2.3 Building, verifying and modifying the DB

Start Date: September 1, 2018　　　　　　　　　　**End Date:** August 31, 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to establish a technical information management system for public performance venues and enhance user convenience in the process. It aims to do this by verifying, modifying, and building on the existing technical information database on the website of the Korean Cultural and Arts Centers Association (KOCACA)[1].

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2. Overall		✓	✓			✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

The milestones under this commitment are verifiable. They include investigating performance venues, collecting and organizing technical information, and building an updated integrated database. There is, however, no clear indication in the commitment text as to how many public performance venues will be included in the database as a result of this commitment.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it will improve opportunities for citizens and service users to access technical and other information on performance venues. As the commitment will expand and build an integrated, online database, it is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency.

At the time of writing this commitment, KOCACA provided limited technical information on stage installations via the theatre technical information database. This included information pertaining to stage plans, sound features, and other technical information. KOACA also confirmed the operation of a social networking service to share this information with the public.[2] However, according to a civil society representative from C.O.D.E., this technical information was inadequately and ineffectively shared with the public.[3] As noted in the action plan, stakeholders agreed that there was room for improvement, especially in terms of convenience of access, coverage of performance venue, and the extent of information disclosed on the database.

This commitment stands to have minor potential impact on improving access to information on public performance venues. The commitment represents a positive effort to improve convenience and access to information through the introduction of an integrated database. According to civil society, the disclosure of such information will enable citizens and businesses to voluntarily engage with and utilize performance venues and the services they offer.[4] However, the information—being technical—will mainly be used by a niche segment of society (i.e., service-users that use the public performance venues) and have limited appeal to citizens at large. Although the government reports setting a goal of covering information from 472 performance venues, there is no clear indication of this under this commitment.

Next steps

As this commitment stands to primarily appeal to and benefit a specialized segment of society, the IRM does not recommend that this commitment is carried forward into future action plans in its current form.

Instead, the IRM recommends that stakeholders refine this commitment and simplify the technicality of information to facilitate its use by a broader segment of the population, and thus encourage wider use of public performance venues across the country. This may include translating technical information into more accessible forms, such as simplified user-guides, explanatory videos, blogs etc.

---

[1] For more information, please see: https://m.kocaca.or.kr/Pages/Main.aspx.
[2] See: www.facebook.com/kocacadb.or.kr
[3] Soohyang Kim (C.O.D.E. Korea), interview by IRM researcher, 3 Jun 2020.
[4] *Id.*

3. Real-name Policy System

Commitment Text:

"Strengthening the System Recording and Managing the Name and Opinions of Those in Charge of Making and/or Executing Policy"

The purpose of this commitment is to strengthen the existing real-name policy system to guarantee democracy and accountability from the public's point of view, and the primary content is as follows: 1) to adopt and operate a procedure where the public's application is received and reviewed (the public-application real-name system) when selecting a real-name policy system instead of leaving it all up to a relevant organization; 2) to make the project overview and real names in relation to the Moon administration's policy tasks publicly available with an exception of nondisclosure cases specified in Official Information Disclosure Act; 3) to expand the range of those whose names must be revealed from working-level personnel (the director level or lower) to those who grant final approvals; 4) the relevant information, which used to be offered separately by an organization in charge, will now be integrated and comprehensively provided at www.open.go.kr

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) 'The operational guidance on the real-name policy' should be drafted and distributed to each organization to raise the level of awareness and boost implementation;

2) If needed, the e-government system should be used to make the real-name recording and disclosure process more convenient.

Milestones:
3.1 Inspecting the enhanced real-name policy system (e. g. the impact of introducing the public application real-name system)
3.2 Drafting the operational guidance on the real-name policy system and distributing it
3.3 Enforcing the public application real-name policy system
3.4 Selecting main subjects and disclosing relevant information
3.5 Evaluating the real-name policy system and providing feedback

Start Date: September 1, 2019   **End Date:** August 31, 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
3. Overall		✓	✓			✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives
In accordance with the Presidential Decree (Regulations on Administrative Efficiency and Promotion of Collaboration), the 'real-name policy system' seeks to promote transparency and accountability

by recording the real names and perspectives of public officials involved in deciding and implementing government policies.

The stated purpose of this commitment is to strengthen the real-name policy system through increased disclosure of information. Such disclosure could be leveraged to advance accountability provided the existence of a public-facing enforcement mechanism. In line with the stated purpose, the commitment proposes to draft and distribute operational guidance to: introduce and enforce a mechanism for citizens to demand real-name disclosure; expand the scope of the system to include more categories of public officials; and publish comprehensive real-name information on an integrated web platform (www.open.go.kr). Prior to this commitment, the Presidential Decree stipulated the scope and operation of the existing system, including the scope of names to be disclosed, relevant management procedures, and regulations on the evaluation of government offices' operation of the system (Articles 3 and 63).

The milestones under this commitment are verifiable. They outline comprehensive activities to strengthen the real-name policy system, primarily centered around the drafting and distribution of operational guidelines. However, despite being generally verifiable, some milestones lack specific details to understand intended results. For instance, it is unclear how real-name system inspection procedures will differ following the introduction of the guidelines. Similarly, while the development and distribution of operational guidelines can be verified, the commitment does not clearly specify how the guidelines will be distributed, implemented, or enforced.

The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it aims to strengthen the disclosure of real-name information in relation to policy decisions and provides a mechanism for citizens to demand such disclosure. However, the commitment does not clearly define whether such a mechanism will mandate a government response and, thereby, is not relevant to the OGP value of public accountability. However, the publication of information on the integrated web platform means that this commitment leverages technology and innovation for transparency.

At the time this commitment was developed, despite the regulations, the existing real-name policy system was limited in scope. According to the action plan, while real-name information from some policy programs was available and open to the public, many others were not. Similarly, the public officials who were to be subject to real-name disclosure were decided solely by the governmental organization drafting the policy, without considering public interest or demands. The action plan also notes that the impact of online disclosure had thus far been limited, as different organizations provided real-name information through different websites and channels.

This commitment stands to have minor potential impact on strengthening the real-name policy system through increased transparency and public accountability. The successful implementation of the operational guidelines can better enable the public to hold officials accountable for policy decisions, and facilitate convenient access to a consolidated, current web platform. This would, in itself, represent a notable improvement from the status quo.

However, as the milestones under this commitment are of limited specificity, it is difficult to provide an accurate assessment of the scope of this commitment. For instance, the commitment does not specify the reach of the operational guidelines nor the scope of policy programs covered. There is also no clear indication of how the public will be able to demand real-name disclosure, and thereby compromises the proposition that the commitment will advance public accountability. In addition, the extent to which the commitment will enable public accountability is further uncertain, as there is no indication of the mandatory nature of the operational guidelines.

Next steps
The increased disclosure of information and provision for public accountability should strengthen the real-name policy system. If this commitment is carried forward into future action plans, the IRM recommends that stakeholders improve the specificity of key milestones in order to facilitate better understanding of objectives and stronger appraisals of impact.

The IRM also encourages future commitments in this policy area to consider:
- Clearly specifying the policy programs that will be subject to information disclosure under the real-name policy system; and
- Expanding the scope of the real-name policy system—with a legislative amendment—to include the disclosure of real-name information of other key stakeholders (i.e., beyond government) that may also be involved in the process of deciding or implementing public policies.

4. Adoption of a Safety Inspection System Powered by the Public Petition

Commitment Text:

"Adoption of a Safety Inspection System Powered by the Public Petition"

The purpose of this commitment is to address the public's concern over the food and drug safety through conducting an inspection on certain food or drug items upon the public's request via petition and sharing the outcome of the inspection transparently. The public's trust on the government in relation to health and safety will be boosted through directly listening to the public's voice and carrying out policies accordingly.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to build and operate a public petition safety inspection website, petition.mfds.go.kr;

2) to create and operate the committee for the public petition safety inspection to select subjects of safety inspections petitioned by a majority of the public and discuss the validity of inspection outcomes;

3) to inspect items with a high number of petitions in the initial stage and ultimately determine the threshold number of petitions based on the analysis of cases.

Milestones:
4.1 Creating selection standard
4.2 Selecting subjects of safety inspections every quarter

Start Date: 1 September 2018　　　　　　　　　　**End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
4. Overall		✓	✓	✓		✓			✓		Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to facilitate public participation in ensuring food and drug safety. It will allow the public to petition for the inspection of items and increase access to this information. The commitment will create selection standards and a committee, who will select items for inspection from public petitions on a quarterly basis. Information from these inspections will be published online, on a dedicated website.[1]

This commitment is verifiable as it outlines measurable milestones including the creation of selection standards and quarterly selection of items for inspection. While the commitment text outlines the main implementation steps, it does not include details on the composition of the subject selection committee, nor the scope of information that will be published. However, enacted in May 2018, the

regulations on the operation of the National Petition Safety Inspection Deliberation Committee specify the expected qualifications of the committee members,[2] and the guidelines for the operation of the National Petition Safety Inspection System detail what information will be disclosed as part of the inspection protocol.[3]

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as public petitioning creates new opportunities for citizens to inform decision-making in the area of food and drug safety. It is also relevant to access to information as the results of the safety inspections will be disclosed to the public. The commitment is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency as it will publish this information on a dedicated website.[4]

This commitment stands to have moderate potential impact on improving access to information and facilitating public participation in food and drug safety processes. According to the Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS), prior to this commitment, only the outcome of safety inspections that were found not to conform with food and drug standards were disclosed to the public.[5] The MFDS also noted that citizens found it difficult to request product inspections.[6] No information on safety inspections was disclosed to the public and the public had no opportunity to request inspections.[7] In general, the commitment stands to shift the National Petition Safety Inspection system from a largely government-led inspection process to a participatory mechanism that responds to citizen concerns.

While this commitment stands to introduce public participation and access to information on food and drug safety inspections, successful implementation depends on the subject selection committee comprising diverse stakeholders, the extent to which public petitions will be proactively selected for inspection, and the information being made accessible to the wider public. While the committee's regulations stipulate an inclusive multistakeholder composition, the commitment does not specify the number of petitions that will be considered under this commitment, nor does it outline any measures to simplify the information for general consumption. This limits an assessment of the full scope of this commitment.

Next steps
Public participation and the increased disclosure of information will strengthen public trust in food and drug safety protocols. If this commitment is carried forward into future action plans, the IRM recommends that stakeholders supplement existing multi-channel efforts to disseminate inspection results with the public, with measures to ensure that the often-technical information on food and drug safety is simplified and published in easily accessible formats.

---

[1] "식품안전나라" [Food Safety Korea] (2020), https://www.foodsafetykorea.go.kr/main.do.

[2] Article 3, Regulations on the Operation of the National Petition Safety Inspection Deliberation Committee (Established Rule No. 153), Ministry of Food and Drug Safety, May 2018.

[3] The IRM received and reviewed a copy of the guidelines during pre-publication review period.

[4] "식품안전나라" [Food Safety Korea] (2020), https://www.foodsafetykorea.go.kr/main.do.

[5] For more information, please see: https://petition.mfds.go.kr/guide.do (in Korean).

[6] Id.

[7] Soohyang Kim (C.O.D.E. Korea), interview by IRM researcher. 3 Jun. 2020.

5-1. Establishment of a Public Diplomacy System to Foster G2P Communication

Commitment Text:

"Establishment of a Public Diplomacy System to foster G2P communication"

This commitment is about building and operating an offline diplomacy center that facilitates the public's opinion sharing and participation in foreign policy. The purpose of the commitment is to obtain the public's understanding and support regarding foreign policy by taking in their opinions and carry out people- and national interest driven diplomacy through fostering the citizen participation and harnessing their diplomatic capacity

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to establish and operate the public diplomacy center along with 'Gwanghwamoon 1st Street, an open communication forum' at the lobby on the first floor of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

2) to conduct research on how to build a system analyzing opinion surveys to meticulously determine the public opinion on major diplomatic issues and relevant big data; to build a citizen participation model catered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and engage the public in policy making; to take in suggestions and opinions from the public at all times through various on- and off-line channels; to select suggestions to be reflected in policy making through multilateral communication and consultation if needed.

Milestones:
5.1.1   Conducting a survey and a citizen participation project
5.1.2   Carrying out a survey, a policy discussion seminar, occasional calls for policy proposals, a citizen participation project, and etc.
5.1.3   Running a survey, a policy discussion seminar, occasional calls for policy proposals, a citizen participation project and etc.

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
5-1. Overall		✓		✓		✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Citizen engagement and participation in governance is a priority of the Moon administration. Innovative efforts include operating an open communication forum (Commitment 5-2), and facilitating public participation in key policy areas such as anticorruption (Commitment 1) and food and drug safety (Commitment 4). This commitment, which will introduce opportunities for public

diplomacy,[1] is in line with this agenda and is another innovative feature of the government's *100 Policy Tasks*.

The purpose of this commitment is to facilitate citizen engagement and participation in determining South Korea's foreign policy. It will do this by building and operating a public diplomacy center at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to receive, analyze, and incorporate public opinion on diplomatic issues. Although this center will operate offline, the commitment also discusses introducing a broader citizen participation system which would include full-time online access. It is envisioned that that this commitment will enhance government-to-public (G2P) communication and strengthen public support of foreign policy.

This commitment is specific enough to be verified as it includes measurable activities such as the establishment of the public diplomacy center and the use of research tools in building a citizen participation system for collecting and analyzing public opinion. However, the precise nature and scope of the envisioned citizen participation system remains unclear.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as it introduces new, inclusive opportunities for citizens to inform the direction of foreign policy. It is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation as it entails the use of online channels to receive suggestions from the public. The commitment does not, however, specify what information will be released to the public or how public suggestions will be considered.

This commitment stands to have minor potential impact on facilitating citizen engagement and participation in developing foreign policy. Apart from introducing new platforms for citizens to contribute to decision-making, the commitment aims to ensure that public opinions are meticulously analyzed and reflected in policies. At the time this commitment was designed, the public had no opportunity to engage or participate in the shaping of foreign policy beyond the standard advocacy by civil society organizations.[2]

However, this commitment remains limited in scope as there is inadequate clarity on the nature and extent of information that citizens will receive from the government. Given the variety of factors that influence foreign policy, the isolated impact of public diplomacy will also be difficult to assess.

Next steps
If this commitment is carried forward into future action plans, the IRM recommends that efforts to facilitate citizen participation are supplemented with activities to promote greater transparency and public accountability.

Therefore, the IRM encourages future commitments in this policy area to consider:

- Publishing and disseminating, both online and offline, accessible information on key foreign policy issues to help citizens share informed opinions and suggestions;
- Publishing and disseminating, both online and offline, regularly updated reports summarizing the impact of public diplomacy activities, including clear records of how public suggestions were incorporated in foreign policy decisions; and
- Conducting and publishing quarterly surveys and qualitative studies to determine levels of engagement, and respond to citizen satisfaction, with efforts to promote public diplomacy.

---

[1] Through pre-publication review of this report, the government noted that 'public diplomacy' refers to any of the various government-sponsored efforts aimed at communicating directly with foreign publics; and proposed the use of the term 'participatory diplomacy' for this commitment instead. See also: Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Public Diplomacy, "Overview" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.mofa.go.kr/eng/wpge/m_5664/contents.do.
[2] For an example of CSO-led advocacy, see: http://www.peoplepower21.org/English.

5-2. Operation of an On-and Offline Open Communication Forum "Gwanghwamoon 1st street"

Commitment Text:

"Operation of an On-and Off-line Open Communication Forum "Gwanghwamoon 1st Street""

The purpose of this commitment is to expand the on- and off-line public participation platform which boosts citizen participation and taps into the public's collective intelligence in policy making. The primary content of the commitment is as follows: find topics for discussion such as chronic social problems and causes for inconvenience that affect people's lives; operate a public platform for policy discussions to have the public's input in the solution building process; provide integrated services to diversify channels of citizen participation in policy making through connected participation channels of multiple organizations and providing a single point of access to relevant services.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to operate an off-line open communication forum as a public policy discussion platform where citizens, experts and public servants discuss social issues closely related with people's lives; to host open communication forums and policy conferences on a regular basis, thereby collecting policy suggestions and forwarding them to relevant offices so that they could be reflected in policy making; to send the forum outcome report to relevant ministries as an official document so that the ministries could collaborate through conducting follow-up meetings and discussions to reflect the outcomes in policy making; to share the entire process with the public through the "the Day of Citizen Participation" ceremony and the publication of a white paper;

2) to provide O2O services via the online citizen participation platform (website); to re-launch the website, currently in provisional operation, as the online citizen participation platform, providing live video streaming of forums and a real-time comment feature during the later half of this year in connection with other citizen participation platforms such as People's Idea Box, an online platform for policy proposals, and e-People officer; to bring about a paradigm shift in the government's operation so that the public could transform social issues into policy agenda and work with the government to solve problems.

Milestones:
5.2.1   Hosting the 10th Open Communication Forum
5.2.2   Hosting a regional conference ('island' theme)
5.2.3   Hosting a policy conference
5.2.4   Hosting the 2019 Open Communication Forum

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
5-2. Overall		✓		✓		✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to expand an on- and offline public participation platform called "Gwanghwamoon 1st street." Following South Korea's "candlelight protest"[1] and an earlier-than-scheduled presidential election, the newly elected Moon administration initially launched the Gwanghwamoon 1st street initiative in 2017 as an offline venue (and later online) to collect ideas from the public at the beginning of its term.[2] Specifically, the project started as an alternative to the Moon administration's transition office to reflect citizens' voices in the new government's priorities and policies. Within a period of 50 days, the project collected over 180,000 proposals.

Building on this successful initiation, this commitment aims to expand the Gwanghwamoon 1st street platform's capacity to boost citizen participation and gather public input. The commitment activities seek to identify chronic social problems and address them by operating public forums for policy discussions between citizens and policymakers. The commitment also aims to relaunch an online platform that connects multiple participation channels and directs citizens to offline services via announcements and livestreams. The commitment indicates South Korea will forward policy ideas and forum outcomes to relevant ministries and that it will organize a "Day of Citizen Participation" to share the entire process with the public through a ceremony and white paper.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as it increases opportunities for citizens to inform government policymaking. It is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency and accountability as it uses technological solutions to enable civic participation through the Gwanghwamoon 1st street online platform.

The milestones are generally verifiable and specific. The commitment notes its focus on improving the Gwanghwamoon 1st street platform and has verifiable milestones to the extent that they refer to concrete and specific outputs (e.g., hosting the 10th Open Communication Forum or hosting a policy conference). The dates for these activities are clearly outlined. However, the milestones do not appear to speak to all components of the commitment outlined in action plan.

Prior to this commitment, Gwanghwamoon 1st street facilitated citizen participation through idea generation and policy consultations.[3] It is an open forum where citizens and public servants discuss social issues and design corresponding policy programs. It also connects citizens to existing online citizen participation platforms such as People's Voice,[4] Blue House Petition,[5] and the newly launched People's Idea Box. As previously described, Gwanghwamoon 1st street originally collected over 180,000 ideas from the public and the Moon administration established 99 ideas as policy tasks.

This commitment adds value to the existing platform by organizing a number of events, forums, and conferences where citizens can share their ideas on policy. However, the commitment stands to have minor potential impact as it does not lay out innovative, ambitious measures and deliverables to

ensure this continued civic participation will affect the policy process. For example, the commitment does not propose any mechanisms or mandates to ensure citizens ideas can actually inform or lead to policy changes. Despite this, in 2018, the government reported that 72 citizen proposals were selected from the Gwanghwamoon 1st street platform, of which 45 (62.5%) were reflected in policies.[6] While the process of translating and developing a citizen proposal into policy is carried out by the government in a transparent manner—and made public on the Gwanghwamoon 1st street website—there remains opportunity to ensure that such deliberation is done systematically, with clear opportunities for citizens to inform and engage in all stages of the policy development process.

Next steps

Noting that this commitment builds on a pre-existing initiative, the IRM recommends pursuing more ambitious milestones that could potentially transform business as usual if this commitment is carried forward into future action plans.

The IRM also recommends the following considerations:
- Consider developing verifiable indicators to measure whether Gwanghwamoon 1st street activities have led to new policies and whether those policies are effective. For example, this could include a formal milestone for agencies' consideration of citizens' policy ideas.
- Consider the institutionalization of Gwanghwamoon 1st street, for example through legislation.

---

[1] Sun-Chul Kim, "South Korea's candlelight protests" (*EastAsiaForum,* 7 Feb. 2017), https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2017/02/07/south-koreas-candlelight-protests/.
[2] Gwanghwamoon 1st street is available at: https://www.gwanghwamoon1st.go.kr/front/main/index.do.
[3] The Government of the Republic of Korea, *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018−2020* (OGP, Aug. 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-action-plan-2018-2020/.
[4] People's voice, a long-time existing online platform of citizen participation, can be found here: https://www.vop.co.kr/index.html
[5] Blue House, Presidential Office, "국민청" [Petition and Citizen Participation] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www1.president.go.kr/petitions.
[6] The Ministry of the Interior and Safety, "Comments received during pre-publication review of the draft IRM Design Report 2018-2020", July 2020

6. Government Innovation Citizen Forum to Realize Participatory Democracy

Commitment Text:

"Government Innovation Citizen Forum to Realize Participatory Democracy"

The purpose of this commitment is to introduce and apply a governance system and mechanism to facilitate government innovation based on citizen participation. In relation to the governance system and mechanism, various organizations including Government Innovation Citizen Forum, the Government Innovation Committee and Government Innovation Support Unit have been established to involve all citizens who would like to participate as agents of innovation in policy making. Against this backdrop, relevant regulations (a presidential instruction) regarding the establishment and operation of the Government Innovation Committee and the Government Innovation Support Unit were laid out to provide institutional support. Also, an online channel to operate the Government Innovation Citizen Forum will be opearated. Government innovation tasks which draw the public's interest or require the public's opinions will be selected and put into a yes-orno vote.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to establish and operate the Government Innovation Citizen Forum that spearhead policy making and improvement by shifting from the top-down approach where policy making on government innovation is solely done by the government to inclusive governance, engaging the public; to establish and operate the Government Innovation Support Unit dedicated to effectively operate the Government Innovation Citizen Forum; if offline discussions are needed to foster the operation of public forums, the Support Unit would carry out various support measures such as hosting discussions at innovation spaces including the Open Communication Forum and the Innovation Park, sharing the outcome of the discussions online, and facilitating the submission of outstanding cases to the Committee; Government Innovation Citizen Forum are to be in charge of monitoring the results of government innovation initiatives which are available online at all times and sharing collected opinions;
2) to establish and operate the Public Evaluation Group which allows citizens to participate in the actual evaluation process;
3) to establish and operate an online channel where policy proposals on government innovation could be applied, suggested, reviewed and selected.

Milestones:
6.1 Launching the Government Innovation Public Forum Bureau
6.2 Operating Government Innovation Public Forums

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
6. Overall		✓		✓		✓			✓		Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Recent years have seen innovative tools for citizen engagement and participation in decision-making, such as the above-mentioned Gwanghwamoon 1st Street, People's Voice, Blue House Petition, and People's Idea Box. This commitment is in line with the overall policy of the government to increase citizen engagement in innovative ways.

The purpose of this commitment is to increase citizen participation in government decision-making by introducing new mechanisms for collecting citizen input on government innovations. The commitment will create a Government Innovation Citizen Forum and the Innovation Support Unit to manage its administrative operations and functioning. The Forum, envisioned as an open platform for public engagement and participation, will review, discuss, and advance proposals on government policy and innovation. The Innovation Support Unit will be in charge of overall administrative work to support the smooth operation of the Forum. According to the government, the proposed Forum will comprise of public representatives and delegates selected from a Steering Committee, appointed to oversee Forum operations.

This commitment is verifiable as it includes measurable milestones such as creating the Innovation Forum, the Support Unit, and the Public Evaluation Group to receive, discuss, and evaluate public proposals on government policy and innovation. While the commitment describes implementation steps, it does not clearly identify what is meant by "government innovations" or whether it includes specific sectors or policies. The commitment does not provide clear targets for the number of policy areas to be discussed within the commitment timeframe, nor does it specify the number of members or participants in the envisioned Forum.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as it creates new mechanisms for citizens to inform policymaking and offer policy proposals on government innovation. It is also relevant to technology and innovation as it entails the creation and operation of an online channel to operate the Forum.

This commitment stands to have moderate potential impact. Although the Korean government has already established prominent channels for citizen participation[1] this commitment adds value to existing initiatives by creating a dedicated and organized forum for citizen participation in advancing and maturing proposals on government policy and innovation. However, as the commitment does not outline the reach of the forum in terms of the type or number of policy areas to be discussed, the full scope of this commitment cannot be assessed.

Next steps

In designing similar commitments in future action plans, the IRM recommends outlining targeted milestones with expected outcomes such as potential policy areas to be discussed, number of participants, and expected outcomes. Specifically:

- Consider documenting and analyzing discussions and proposals when setting up the next phase of Public Innovation Forum; and
- Evaluation of the Forum activities, including the work of the proposed Public Evaluation Group, should focus on user experience, the number of submitted proposals, feedback mechanisms, and the number of ideas discussed and taken up by the government.

---

[1] E.g., Gwanghwamoon 1st Street and People's Idea-box.

7. Disclosure of the Amount of Harmful Substance Contained in Foods

Commitment Text:

"Disclosure of the Amount of Harmful Substance Contained in Foods"

This commitment is about making the following information publically available: the amount of harmful substance contained in foods largely and frequently consumed by the public (19 types). The changes in the amount of harmful substance contained in foods as a result of global warming and environmental pollution are continuously made available to the public. Such changes include the following raw data: the food type (item), the manufacturer/producer country, the area of production, the area of collection and the detected amount. The public's anxiety over the food safety could be relieved, and citizens would be given choices for healthy foods as the aforementioned information is made publically available.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to create and update a database with the information on the level of contamination of foods every five years and provide 'the harmful substance quick search service' to allow convenient search;

2) to provide detailed information on types of inspected foods, items, manufacturer and producer countries, areas of collection, places of collection (small, medium and large sized supermarkets and traditional market places), the level of contamination by food in downloadable files for research purposes;

3) to share the management approach with the public according to the findings through disclosing the reevaluation report on standards

Milestones:
7.1 Inspecting the level of contamination of highly and frequently consumed foods (19 types)
7.2 Disclosing the level of contamination of 8 types of fungal toxin (Quick search, research materials, the reevaluation report)
7.3 Disclosing the level of contamination of dioxin and PCBs (Quick search, research materials, the reevaluation report)
7.4 Disclosing the level of contamination of benzopyrene (Quick search, research materials, the reevaluation report)
7.5 Disclosing the level of contamination of 3-MCPD and melamine (Quick search, research materials, the reevaluation report)
7.6 Disclosing the level of contamination of 6 types of heavy metal (Quick search, research materials, the reevaluation report)

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
7. Overall		✓	✓			✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to increase access to information on the amount of harmful substances in food frequently consumed by the public. The commitment will create a regularly updated database containing relevant information, with downloadable files for research purposes. Additionally, it will publish reports on how the Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS) reevaluates standards. This commitment stands to alleviate public concerns about food safety and empower citizens to make healthier choices.

This commitment is verifiable as it outlines measurable milestones, such as disclosing specific toxin levels in 19 types of frequently consumed food. Although the "quick search" and "downloadable files" text confirms that the information will be available online, the commitment does not specify if the information also will be shared offline.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it endeavors to publicly disclose government-held information pertaining to the safety of food. It is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency as it aims to disclose this information on an online platform built for this purpose.

Environmental pollution and climate change have increased the risk of food being contaminated with harmful substances. The MFDS commenced research into the extent of food contamination in 2015,[1] with longitudinal case reports being published on a dedicated food safety website.[2] This commitment improves accessibility to this data by reformatting the database.[3] Specifically, key monitoring data (including details on harmful substances) and data on the geographic origin of the food will be categorized and published in an open and accessible manner.[4] Therefore, this commitment stands to have a positive but incremental impact on alleviating public concerns around food safety.

Next steps

Increasing access to information on harmful substances in food empowers the public to make healthier consumption choices. If this commitment is carried forward into future action plans, the IRM recommends building on existing efforts to raise ambition in the following ways:

- Allowing citizens to submit special inquiries into the amount of harmful substances found in an expanded category of food types;
- Establishing and publishing a clear protocol and timeline for responsible stakeholders to provide reasoned responses to citizen inquiries about contamination; and
- Regularly publishing and disseminating findings on contamination levels in key items through offline channels, such as leaflets or media, to facilitate wider public reach, and engaging educators to ensure that youth are aware of such information as well.

[1] See Ministry of Food and Drug Safety, "식품정보" [Food Information] (2019), https://bit.ly/2BG7CUR.

[2] "식품안전나라" [Food Safety Korea] (2020), https://www.foodsafetykorea.go.kr/main.do.

[3] *Ibid.* [Food Safety Korea Database] (2020), https://www.foodsafetykorea.go.kr/portal/fooddanger/fungalToxinBoardSe.do?menu_grp=MENU_NEW04&menu_no=3996.

[4] Miok Eom (Food Standard Planning Office, Ministry of Food and Drug Safety), interview by IRM researcher (June 2020).

8. Open Data for Future Culture and Tourism Industries

Commitment Text:

"Open Data for Future Culture and Tourism Industries"

The purpose of this commitment is to further disclose the core data on culture, thereby supporting new industries. The scope of this initiative does not include the data made public through the Korea Tourism Organization and the National Museum of Korea. A relevant service platform will be established as a part of this commitment to provide services integrating local governments' cultural data.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to gather core data that could be used to support the VR, AR, AI and IoT industry and disclose them; to this end, a cooperation system to work with local governments should be built to mine core data at the local level;

2) to build a platform providing connected services that allows integrated collection, sharing and utilization of cultural data; the establishment of the platform involves the standardization of cultural information meta data, the establishment of the meta data management platform, the establishment of a system to use the external knowledge base (i. e. the Korean dictionary and the encyclopedia of Korean culture) and the establishment of a LOD-based cultural data base categorized by topic (i. e. traditional patterns, the Korean cuisine and Hangul).

Milestones:
8.1 Disclosing more cultural data essential in new industries
8.2 Creating a Public-Private Partner entity in disclosing and using cultural data
8.3 Creating standards to share and connect cultural data
8.4 Building a platform connecting services provided by local governments

Start Date: 1 September 2018 **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
8. Overall		✓	✓			✓		✓			*Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*				*Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.*				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to increase disclosure of core data on culture and tourism and, in doing so, support the local tourist industry to develop innovative, technology-driven content. The commitment will create a new public-private partner organization, operated by the Korean Cultural Information Centre (KCSIA)[1], under the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism. The commitment will also establish a multi-ministry service platform which will integrate and publicly share cultural data from across the different levels of government, including local governments.[2]

This commitment is generally verifiable as it outlines a number of measurable milestones including the establishment of a public-private organization to lead the disclosure of core cultural data, the introduction of standards on the sharing of such data, and the creation of a service platform. While the commitment does not specify the channels through which the data will be published, GPS-based cultural information is generally shared via the online platform, www.culture.go.kr. The commitment also does not identify the new categories of information that will be made available, specify the composition of the proposed public-private organization, or describe its roles and functions.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it entails increasing the disclosure of core tourism and cultural data for public use. The commitment is also relevant to the OGP value of technology and innovation for transparency as it aims to build an online service platform to integrate and publish this data.

This commitment stands to have minor potential impact on increasing the disclosure of cultural and tourism data to support content creation in the local tourist industry. The commitment will disclose new core data, and also aims to establish a new service platform to collect and integrate meta data from across local governments. National and local governments manage data in different formats, with data from local government often being more detailed.[3] This represents an opportunity for local tourism industries to develop new technology and upgrade information available for tourists.

However, according to the action plan, the Korea Tourism Organization (KTO) and the National Museum of Korea already possessed quality content and were making some data public, such as the number of tourist arrivals[4] or the museum's collection of items, prior to this commitment.[5] These organizations lacked access to technology to manage and disseminate such data effectively. As it is unclear what new data will be disclosed, the full scope of this commitment is difficult to determine.

Next steps

Increasing disclosure of core cultural data will equip the local tourism industry, and related private-sector organizations, with the information necessary to develop and upgrade technology-driven cultural content. However, as the scope of added value of this commitment remains unclear, the IRM does not recommend that it is carried forward into the next action plan.

To increase the overall positive outcome of data disclosure initiatives in the culture sector, the IRM recommends the following:
- Develop a user-friendly, interactive, and multilingual features on the online platform that consolidates cultural data and information from across South Korea.
- Introduce a multilingual public feedback mechanism that collects and responds to requests for cultural information from domestic and international tourists to South Korea. This mechanism could be a feature of the online platform.
- Publish and disseminate responses to frequently asked questions, obtained through the public feedback mechanism. These responses could also be featured on the online platform.

---

[1] The Korean Cultural Information Centre is available at: https://www.kcisa.kr/.

[2] Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, Cultural Data, "문화데이터" [Culture data] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.mcst.go.kr/kor/s_open/government/appCase.jsp; KCISA, "문화데이터 개방 및 이용활성화" [Opening and Activating Cultural Data] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.kcisa.kr/kr/contents/buss_data_open_4/view.do.

[3] Soohyang Kim (C.O.D.E. Korea), interview by IRM researcher, 3 Jun. 2020.

[4] Korea Tourism Organization, "Visitor Arrivals, Korean Departures, Int'l Tourism Receipts & Expenditures" (2015), http://kto.visitkorea.or.kr/eng/tourismStatics/keyFacts/visitorArrivals.kto.

[5] National Museum of Korea, "Collection Database" (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.museum.go.kr/site/eng/relic/search/list.

9. Disclosure of the Cultural Heritage Resources for New Industries in the Private Sector

Commitment Text:

"Disclosure of the cultural Heritage Resources for New Industries in the Private Sector"

The purpose of this commitment is to help the private sector build high value-added industries such as a 3D printing industry through converting the raw data derived by using a high precision 3D scanner to restore the original form of cultural heritage in case of loss or damage due to an earthquake or fire into offering ready-to-use data for 3D printing.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to build and operate a cultural heritage 3D web portal (Dec, 2018~) by collecting and converting 3D scanner raw data created by the Culture Heritage Administration, its affiliated organizations and local governments in order to allow citizens to access all cultural heritage 3D data; to disclose 1,000 sets of various data including 264 sets of 3D scanned data, 100 sets of printing data, 5 sets of braille data and 3D modeling data within 2018 through the web portal; to disclose additional 50 sets of 3D printing data, thereby disclosing about 1,500 sets of public data in 2019 and accumulatively increase the number to 2,000 in 2020;

2) to create and distribute 3D content tailored to diverse sectors through an industry-university-research institute-government partnership involving 3D printing related associations, metropolitan and provincial Offices of Education, universities, museums and research institutes;

3) to strengthen the quality management of 3D data such as developing a production guideline on 3D scanned data.

Milestones:
9.1 Building a 2018 cultural heritage 3D database – 50 sets of 3D scanning and 50 sets of printing.
9.2 Building a cultural heritage 3D web portal.
9.3 Hosting a cultural heritage themed 3D printing competition (the 3rd 3D Printing Korea Expo, Gumi, Korea)
9.4 Hosting a special exhibition using 3D content as part of HERITAGE KOREA 2018 (Gyeongju Hwabaek International Convention Center, HICO)
9.5 Delivering a presentation on best practices on exchanges of advanced technologies at the Digital Heritage 2018 (San Francisco) - 3D scanning and printing of cultural heritage)
9.6 Disclosing 1,000 sets of public data including 3D modeling data of cultural heritage.
9.7 Building a 2019 cultural heritage 3D database - disclosing 1,500 sets of accumulated public data including 50 sets of 3D printing data
9.8 Building a 2020 cultural heritage 3D database - disclosing 2,000 sets of accumulated public data including 50 sets of 3D printing data

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
9. Overall		✓	✓			✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to increase access to scanned, high-precision, 3D data on cultural heritage resources. This data can be used by the 3D-printing industry to recreate items in the case of loss or damage due to earthquakes or fires.[1] The application of 3D scanning and printing allows this replication without having to use traditional techniques that could be too invasive for often delicate cultural heritage artifacts.

The commitment will offer public access to this 3D data via a web portal[2] with the ultimate goal of disclosing 2,000 sets of scanned 3D data, creating and distributing sector-tailored 3D content through a multistakeholder partnership, and strengthening the management and quality-control of 3D data. In addition, the commitment proposes other activities, such as hosting a competition, an exhibition, and a presentation on 3D content and printing to raise awareness and build capacity.

This commitment is specific enough to be verifiable as it identifies several measurable milestones such as the development of a 3D web portal, the disclosure of a specific number of datasets, and the hosting of special events. The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it aims to facilitate public access to 3D data on cultural heritage resources by converting raw data into a ready-to-use format using a high-precision 3D scanner. The action plan suggests that the web portal will allow all citizens to access this data indiscriminately. The use of a web portal means that this commitment is also relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency.

This commitment has a minor potential impact on public access to ready-to-use 3D data on cultural heritage resources. The regularly updated web portal is a departure from the status quo as 3D data was previously inaccessible for public use.[3] Prior to this commitment, 3D scanning was used for accumulating basic data for prototype restoration, and only circulated within the government.

The government also notes that through competitions, presentations, and special exhibitions, along with the commercialization of 5G communication, public awareness and demand for 3D data will expand significantly. 3D data can be used, for instance, to produce realistic entertainment content, such as virtual reality and holograms. However, at present, the 3D data—being technical—is most likely to be used by a niche segment of society (i.e., 3D printers and other related industries) and have limited appeal to citizens at large. This commitment is thus limited in scope.

Next steps

As this commitment stands to primarily appeal to and benefit a specialized segment of society, the IRM does not recommend that this commitment is carried forward into future action plans in its current form.

---

[1] According to a representative of the Cultural Heritage Administration, there is a long history of damage or destruction of cultural heritage resources due to historic wars and natural disasters. In 2017, for instance, the Pohang earthquake damaged 31 valuable cultural artifacts, while the Gangwon-do forest fire in 2005 significantly damaged the 15th century Naksansa Temple and wooden artifacts contained within it.

[2] Cultural Heritage Administration, "3D 문화유산 소개" [Introduction to 3D Cultural Heritage] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://bit.ly/3cz54pm.

[3] Cultural Heritage Administration representative, interview by IRM, June 2020.

10. Disclosure of the nation's Priority Data with High Utility, Demand and Value in the Public Arena

Commitment Text:

"Disclosure of the nation's Priority Data with High Utility, Demand and Value in the Public Arena"

The purpose of this commitment is to dramatically expand the subject of public data disclosure to include areas closely related to people's lives such as environment, safety and healthcare and sectors in relation to new technologies such as AI, IoT and self-driving vehicles. 38 sets of important data determined through a public survey on public data, interviews on relevant associations and companies, a study on utilization of public data will be disclosed by 2019. The data sets include the following: information on buildings based on their age and use, earthquake emergency shelters, buildings with seismic design, safety management of public facilities, statistics of food and drug, sales of meat and processed meat, jobs, automobiles, national energy, public health alert, public health nutrition, air pollutant emission and intelligent traffic accident analysis.

The following will be conducted to implement the commitment:

1) conducting a demand survey on the public and businesses to determine the national importance of the data, usage of the data, conditions regarding the disclosure and usage and the potential value of the data in order to select the data to be disclosed;

2) establishing disclosure strategies, developing a system for the disclosure and managing the quality in relation to the selected data.

Milestones:

10.1 Conducting the second round of disclosure of the nation's core data primarily on intelligent and new industries
10.2 Conducting a public demand survey
10.3 Determining the nation's potential core data based on the review of private-sector experts (the expert committee)

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
10. Overall		✓	✓	✓					✓		Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

The purpose of this commitment is to expand ongoing efforts in public data disclosure to include areas such as the environment, health and safety, and new technologies (artificial intelligence,

Internet-of-Things, and autonomous vehicles). The commitment will conduct a survey to determine public demand, select priority areas for data disclosure, manage data quality, and establish disclosure strategies. This commitment builds on similar data disclosure commitments from South Korea's third national action plan. Through those commitments, the government disclosed over 22,000 datasets on topics ranging from regional financial data to food waste data through its Open Data Portal and completed quality control and evaluation of 21 public datasets.[1]

This commitment is specific enough to be verifiable as it identifies measurable milestones such as the disclosure of sector-specific, core data and conducting a public demand survey. According to the action plan, 38 important sets of data in predetermined areas will also be disclosed through this commitment. Although the commitment does not specify disclosure strategies or where this data, and the data from the new areas, will be published, the government noted that high priority data has previously been disclosed on the government's data portal.[2]

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as it aims to increase public access to government-held data in a number of priority areas. It is also relevant to the value of civic participation as a public demand survey will empower citizens to identify and share priority areas for data disclosure and thereby influence related decision-making. The publication of data on an online platform also makes this commitment relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency.

The disclosure and effective use of public data stand to enhance government transparency, deliver effective and efficient services, and contribute to economic growth. Prior to the introduction of this commitment, South Korea had taken important steps toward improving public data disclosure. For instance, in 2013, the country enacted the *Act on Promotion of the Provision and Use of Public Data* and has since been actively expanding the number and areas of datasets accessible to the public. This includes efforts to increase and improve data disclosure through commitments in previous OGP action plans. The public data portal also has a feature that regularly solicits data requests from citizens and thus allows the government to respond to citizens.[3]

This commitment stands to have moderate potential impact on existing efforts around public data disclosure. Although the commitment builds on previous efforts, the identification and introduction of new priority areas for disclosure represents a significant step in the right direction. The disclosure of such data is particularly meaningful as it is based on public demand identified through a citizen demand survey.[4] The scope of this commitment may be further enhanced if the prioritized data will be further reviewed and vetted by the expert committee. While the commitment does not outline such protocol, existing guidelines on the management of projects to support the use of public data[5] provide for the committee—mainly comprising of private sector experts—to perform this function.

Despite the importance of data disclosure, vetting, and quality management, the eventual reach and value of such data is reliant on effective outreach to raise public awareness on the availability of the data and building capacity on how to leverage data to inform decision-making. This commitment does not include activities along these lines.

Next steps
Expanding ongoing efforts in public data disclosure stand to reinforce South Korea as a regional and global leader in public open data initiatives. Given the notable progress that South Korea has made in public data disclosure since 2013, the IRM recommends that future action plans continue efforts to expand disclosure to high value datasets. In doing so, the IRM recommends the following:
- Use online and offline communication to promote the public datasets' availability; and
- Provide training and clear guidelines on how public data can be leveraged and used by citizens to influence decision-making.

---

[1] *See* Open Data Portal (Korea Information Technology Agency) at: https://www.data.go.kr/.

[2] *Id.* National Focus Data (Korea Information Technology Agency) at:
https://www.data.go.kr/tcs/eds/selectCoreDataListView.do

[3] *Id.*

[4] Soohyang Kim (C.O.D.E. Korea), IRM Questionnaire (Online), 3 Jun. 2020.

[5] The IRM received and reviewed a copy of these guidelines during pre-publication review period.

11. Enhancement of the Quality Management of Public Data through Collecting the Public's Opinion

Commitment Text:

"Enhancement of the Quality Management of Public Data through Collecting the Public's Opinion"

The purpose of this commitment is to produce more quality data and increase the usage of such data through encouraging the public including citizens and businesses to participate in policy making regarding the quality management of public data. To do so, the following will be conducted: 1) providing more standards for disclosing the public data and open formats regarding data with high demand amongst the public and owned by multiple organizations (e. g. the domains of self-driving vehicles, smart city, health care and smart farm are selected considering the demand in the public) 2) reflecting the user's request regarding the problems in the quality of public data through operating the suggestion box year-round 3) involving the public throughout the entire policy implementation process including the establishment, implementation and outcome (impact) of policies on the quality management of public data. The implementation of this commitment will support free convergence between the public and private data, reduce the cost of processing and refining data of the public and businesses and enhance the value of using the public data.

The detailed implementation method of this commitment is as follows:

1) conducting a public demand survey on standardization and quality enhancement of public data

2) operating the year-round public suggestion box such as "the error report center for public data" within the public data portal and "the Data 1st Street"

3) receiving the public's opinions regarding the quality management through establishing the public council

Milestones:

11.1 Conduct a public demand survey on standardization and quality enhancement of public data
11.2 Operating a suggestion box for public data users year-round
11.3 Building and operating a public-private cooperative body for standardization of public data
11.4 Conducting an evaluation on public data quality management and having quality evaluators from the private sector participate in the process

Start Date: 1 September 2018   **End Date:** 31 August 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
11. Overall		✓	✓	✓					✓		Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of action plan cycle.				

47

Context and Objectives

Linked to Commitment 10, which aims to expand disclosure of public data, the purpose of this commitment is to produce higher quality public data and increase its usage by citizens and businesses. The commitment aims to encourage inclusive participation in decision-making around the management and standardization of data quality through public demand surveys, suggestion boxes, and a public-private council to capture and represent public opinion.

This commitment is verifiable as it identifies a number of specific and measurable milestones such as the introduction of a suggestion box and the establishment of a public-private council. However, at a more macro, outcome-level, the commitment does not define "quality data," it does not indicate how much the commitment aims to increase data usage, and it does not specify how the public input will be used to inform decision making. The Act on the Provision and Use of Public Data[1] and the Guidelines for Public Data Management provide direction on the measures that public institutions should take in order to ensure adequate data quality.

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as the activities aim to improve the quality of information being made available to the public. It is also relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as the public-private council allows citizens and businesses to participate in government decision-making about managing data quality and standards.

At the time this commitment was designed, the public data portal published a range of data, and often responded to requests received through the portal.[2] However, this regular exchange was frequently hampered by poor data quality. Specifically, inadequate standardization, missing data, and the inconsistent use of data formats diminished the utility of public data, and discouraged stakeholders from leveraging its full potential. According to a civil society representative, it cost citizens and other interested stakeholders time and money to refine, process, and integrate data of poor quality.[3]

This commitment seeks to address these concerns through the inclusive participation of key stakeholders in ensuring data quality and standards. Civil society noted that involving citizens and businesses in data management decisions should enhance data quality and usage.[4] Although citizens and businesses could file requests for public data on the portal prior to this commitment,[5] there was no opportunity for them to be involved in decision-making processes around the management of data quality.[6]

This commitment stands to have moderate potential impact on producing higher quality public data and increasing data usage among citizens and businesses. Although limited in terms of specificity, the commitment outlines measures to involve citizens and businesses in managing data quality and civil society stakeholders are confident that this will further improve data quality and usage.[7] However, data quality and usage have been increasing steadily over the years;[8] so the extent to which inclusive participation in decision-making will improve data quality and usage cannot be easily verified.

Next steps

As noted in Commitment 10, better data quantity and quality could position South Korea as a regional and global leader in public open data initiatives. Therefore, the IRM recommends the next action plan continue efforts in this area. However, in doing so, the IRM recommends that stakeholders build on existing efforts to raise the ambition of future commitments in the following ways:

- Provide training and clear guidelines on how public data can be leveraged and used by citizens to inform decision-making; and
- Organize workshops, hackathons, or other competitions to support the utilization of public data in resolving societal issues.

---

[1] Article 22, "공공데이터의 제공 및 이용 활성화에 관한 법률" [Act on the Promotion of Provision and Use of Public Data], 26 July 2017, Act No. 14839

[2] The Open Data Portal (Korea Information Technology Agency) is available at: https://www.data.go.kr/.

[3] Soohyang Kim (C.O.D.E. Korea), IRM Questionnaire (Online), 3 Jun. 2020.

[4] *Id.*

[5] The Open Data Portal, https://www.data.go.kr/.

[6] Kim, interview.

[7] *Id.*

[8] According to the action plan, alongside an increased demand for data disclosure, the use of public data saw a 120-fold increase between 2013 and 2016 alone. The Government of the Republic of Korea, *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018−2020* (OGP, Aug. 2018) 36, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-action-plan-2018-2020/.

12. Transition towards the Customs Administration System Based on Voluntary Compliance

Commitment Text:

"Transition towards the Customs Administration System Based on Voluntary Compliance"

The purpose of this commitment is to create a voluntary compliance environment focused on "cooperation and prevention" to reduce conflicts with the public and increase the level of understanding and acceptance over relevant policies in customs and border control. To do so,

1) the customs administration will be reformed from coerced investigation and tax imposition to preemptive provision of information to facilitate the public's voluntary compliance and tax payment. For example, the import tax settlement system which allows businesses to autonomously inspect and settle the unpaid tax amount notified by the customs will be expanded. Also, the pre-evaluation system, a consulting program where the Commissioner of Customs decides on the tax amount and taxable price before the declaration will be expanded.

2) Instead of prosecuting offenders, information will be provided on areas where violation is most likely to occur in order to eliminate conflicts and protect human rights. In this regard, information on declarations errors and violation and educational briefings will be provided prior to crackdown and sanctions in order to encourage honest and accurate tax report. In addition, supervisory crackdowns on relevant industries regarding minor yet frequently violated matters will be preannounced and carried out.

3) The public's opinions on travelers' personal belongings, most relevant to the public, will be collected and reflected in policy making to encourage voluntary declarations and autonomous compliance through carrying out a public survey, operating the public design group, participating in public participation forums. The public's level of understanding on customs policies will increase, and their right to know will be ensured through preventing coerced administrative execution and customs violations through public-private cooperation and autonomous compliance. Furthermore, conflicts amongst the business, government and public will be minimized thanks to the preemptive provision of information and autonomous compliance, and the public's trust and confidence will be boosted through conducting safer and more effective customs and border control with more accurate export-and-import declaration through voluntary participation.

The detailed implementation methods are as follows:

1) to build a system to inform the public of how to file a customs declaration tailored to a type of tax payers using big data including the export-and-import declaration and register and disclose the information via the Customs Law Information Portal;

2) to provide tax payment support services tailored to companies via the e-customs clearance system to help the individuals and businesses to file a customs declaration without an error by disclosing and sharing information on possible errors on tax payment;

3) to inform the public of the possibility of legal violation through monitoring online advertisements on reselling products directly purchased from overseas and selling counterfeited products in partnership with operators of internet communities;

4) to reform the government's internal performance evaluation system from examining exposure, crackdown and collection to the operation of dutiful declaration support, tax payment cooperation programs and preliminary guidance.

Milestones:
12.1 Updating the DB of the Customs Law Information Portal
12.2 Building the system to provide information on possible tax payment errors tailored to businesses
12.3 Establishing the check-list of errors per industry and item
12.4 Hosting an annual briefing per customs office
12.5 Publishing a guide book on dutiful tax declaration
12.6 Carrying out an initiative to support SMEs from getting officially certified

12.7 Disclosing the evaluation standard of compliance and providing training
12.8 Operating the public design group to encourage voluntary tax declaration
12.9 Conducting a survey on the public's level of awareness on the declaration of personal belongings when traveling
12.10 Carrying out the regular import-tax settlement system
12.11 Providing preliminary information on legal violation (on- and off-line)
12.12 Conducting monitoring and guidance activities to prevent crimes and irregularities regarding customs duty
12.13 Promoting the preemptive provision of legal information offered offline

Start Date: April, 2018   **End Date:** August, 2020

Editorial Note: For the full text of the commitment, please see *Korea's 4th National Action Plan 2018-2020* at https://bit.ly/2JvQr98.

Commitment Overview	Verifiability		OGP Value Relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion				Did It Open Government?				
	Not specific enough to be verifiable	Specific enough to be verifiable	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did Not Change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
12. Overall		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓			Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				Assessed at the end of the action plan cycle.				

Context and Objectives

Traditionally, customs administration in South Korea was characterized by coerced investigations, tax charges, crackdowns, and punishment. As noted in the action plan, this led to social and other costs in the form of civil disobedience and tax-related conflict.

The purpose of this commitment is to reform coercive customs administration into a conciliatory environment of voluntary compliance, focusing on "cooperation and prevention." Government and civil society stakeholders anticipate that this approach will reduce conflict and increase mutual understanding between citizens, customs, and border control. This, in turn, will lead to greater citizen adherence to tax protocols, more effective customs administration, and the many economic benefits associated with such developments. To do this, the commitment primarily aims to promote preemptive information disclosure in a number of areas, be it to facilitate voluntary tax compliance, or to inform citizens of potential declaration errors and violations before they occur.

This commitment is verifiable as it outlines a number of measurable milestones, such as publishing a guidebook on tax declarations, creating a system to provide information on tax payment errors, and promoting the preemptive provision of legal information online. However, several milestones lack specificity and often refer to broad activities with limited indication of scope. For example, the commitment does not define what is meant by the "operation of the public design group to encourage voluntary tax deduction" or "carrying out the regular import-tax settlement system."

This commitment is relevant to the OGP value of access to information as a number of activities aim to preemptively release government-held information on customs administration. The commitment is also relevant to the OGP value of civic participation as certain activities will empower citizens to

participate in, and influence, decision-making processes. For instance, results from a public survey on the declaration of personal belongings when traveling will inform related policymaking. In addition, the use of online platforms to publish government information also makes this commitment relevant to the value of technology and innovation for transparency.

This commitment stands to have minor potential impact on reforming customs administration in South Korea. According to the action plan, at the time this commitment was designed, customs administration in the country was largely characterized by confrontational features of coercion and sanction. This led to tension between the service providers and recipients, and instances of mass-scale disobedience in the form of tax avoidance and defaults.

This commitment endeavors to comprehensively reform this adversarial approach into one of voluntary compliance, premised on the preemptive disclosure of information; but this will entail a difficult shift in organizational culture of customs administration While the overall objective of this commitment is a positive step forward, the scale of the challenge at hand is compounded by the limited specificity of several activities and milestones, to limit the scope of this commitment.

Next steps

An environment of voluntary tax compliance, premised on preemptive government disclosure of information, could be a significant reform for customs administration in South Korea. If effectively and holistically implemented, such reform could transform the relationship between tax assessors and the public.

However, as the scope of this commitment remains unclear, the IRM does not recommend that this commitment is carried forward into future action plans in its current form.

V. General Recommendations

This section aims to inform development of the next action plan and guide implementation of the current action plan. It is divided into two sections: 1) IRM key recommendations to improve OGP process and action plans in the country or entity and, 2) an assessment of how the government responded to previous IRM key recommendations.

5.1 IRM Recommendations

South Korea's fourth action plan contains commitments that are more specific, relevant to OGP values, and ambitious, than commitments included in the previous action plan. All 13 commitments included in this action plan are relevant to OGP values and all of them are generally specific enough to be verifiable. Out of these commitments, nine seek to advance access to information, and eight promote increased levels of civic participation. An overwhelming majority of commitments (ten) also seek to leverage technology and innovation to promote transparency. Although a few commitments endeavor to set up and increase opportunities for citizens to hold government accountable, primarily through the disclosure of information, none of the proposed activities or commitments are coded as advancing the OGP value of public accountability, as defined in the IRM Procedures Manual.[1]

This action plan not only more closely reflects open governance, but also moves beyond the traditional focus of increasing access to information, to innovative initiatives that promote civic participation. In doing so, the plan strategically leverages the OGP platform to advance reforms included in *100 Policy Tasks*—the five-year plan of the Moon Jae-In administration.[2]

This action plan contains five commitments assessed by the IRM to have moderate potential impact. These commitments are well-designed and, if fully implemented, stand to contribute to notable improvements in their respective policy areas. However, the IRM also assesses eight of the thirteen commitments to have minor potential impact. These commitments represent the potential for positive, but incremental improvements in the respective policy areas. The IRM recommends that South Korea focuses on designing ambitious commitments in future action plans and leverage the values of open government to address the country's most pertinent policy issues.

The process of developing the action plan also experienced incremental improvements from the previous action plan cycle. The increased involvement of civil society, the operation of the multistakeholder Open Government Forum Korea (OGF), and the use of its online platform to receive commitment proposals, are key process-related achievements. However, South Korea can improve on the limited influence of citizens and civil society priorities in the selection criteria of the final commitments, and the failure to openly publish reasoned responses on the inclusion or omission of commitment proposals on the OGFK website.

As South Korea begins developing its fifth action plan, the IRM proposes the following recommendations to further strengthen South Korea's commitment to open government reform and, in doing so, fulfil its heightened expectations as an incoming Government Co-Chair of the OGP Steering Committee.[3] As it takes on this role, South Korea is presented with an opportunity, and responsibility, to design a strong OGP process and pursue more ambitious domestic reforms, thus demonstrating global thematic leadership.

1. **Broaden and deepen public participation in the OGP process through proactive communication, wider consultations, and enhanced citizen engagement.**

While the establishment and operation of the OGFK strengthened the role of civil society in the development of the action plan, more can be done to facilitate participation of a wider group of diverse stakeholders in the OGP process. In particular, steps could be taken to improve communication and outreach; provide opportunities for remote participation; and expand the stakeholder base involved in the development of the action plan.

In proposing specific recommendations in this regard, the IRM draws on OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards[4] to suggest the following:
- **Communication:** Proactively communicate, with adequate advance notice, the process of action plan development. This could include, for example, sharing a timeline of activities and consultations, providing clear information on participation opportunities, and outlining the key steps in the decision-making process, including the criteria for selecting commitments.
- **Remote Participation:** Facilitate remote participation in cocreation meetings and events to enable inclusion of stakeholders unable to attend in person. This may entail, for instance, hosting inclusive consultation workshops beyond the capital city, Seoul.
- **Stakeholder Base:** Strengthen outreach to encourage active participation by a wider base of stakeholders in developing the action plan. This may include, for instance, developing a strategy to ensure the involvement of CSOs and government agencies outside the OGFK and the sustained representation and engagement of the legislature and judiciary throughout the co-creation process. Outreach may also aim to include more diverse CSOs, beyond those working on open government, including unions, cooperatives, and student movements.

Beyond broadening the base of stakeholders involved in developing South Korea's next action plan, there is significant opportunity to deepen the nature and extent of stakeholder contributions in setting the country's open government agenda.

In proposing recommendations in this regard, the IRM draws on OGP's Participation and Co-Creation Standards[5] to suggest the following:
- **Citizen Priorities:** Introduce a process that ensures that ambitious citizen and civil society proposals are included in the final action plan. The OGFK could aim to restructure commitment development and selection so that commitments reflecting citizen and CSO priorities are not only OGP-relevant and specific, but also feasible and aligned with government priorities.
- **Consultations:** Expand consultations on the action plan development beyond the OGF portal to other online and offline channels of citizen engagement. For instance, consultations to solicit commitment proposals could also be published on pre-existing platforms for collecting public opinion, such as Gwanghwamoon First Street, People's Voice,[6] or the Blue House Petition.[7]
- **Reasoned Responses:** Publish, via the OGFK portal, clear reasoning behind the final selection of commitments in the action plan, including justifications for commitment proposals that were not included.

2. **Design ambitious, relevant, and specific commitments in policy areas aligned with South Korea's OGP Steering Committee Co-Chair priorities.[8]**

As incoming Government Co-Chair of the OGP Steering Committee, South Korea aims to prioritize activities to "promote participatory democracy at all levels; pursue public values toward an inclusive state; and renew trust through government innovation".[9] While South Korea endeavors to support and work with OGP member countries to realize these key

priorities, the country also has an important opportunity to introduce its own domestic reforms and showcase global leadership in these areas. To leverage this opportunity, South Korea might consider including ambitious commitments in its next action plan, e.g., online and offline citizen engagement platforms at the local government level or innovative mechanisms that utilize data for problem solving.

In designing and introducing such commitments, South Korea should focus on ensuring ambition, relevance, and specificity. Reflecting an improvement on prior plans, South Korea's current action plan includes commitments that are all relevant to OGP values and generally specific enough to be verifiable. While the feasibility of implementing a commitment within the action plan cycle should remain an important consideration in the selection and design of commitments, several commitments build incrementally on existing initiatives, with limited indication of transforming business as usual. Several commitments also focus on niche areas with narrow public appeal, which undermines the potential of leveraging current support for broader government reform. In addition, many commitments continue to have activities of limited specificity, which hinders an assessment of the commitment's full scope. These characteristics render such commitments to be of low potential impact.

The IRM recommends consideration of the following:
- **Commitment Design**: Clearly specify the objective of the commitment, noting how the commitment will achieve this goal. The text should define the status-quo of the policy problem that the commitment addresses. This description should be accompanied by a clear articulation of how the proposed activities under each commitment will leverage open governance to address the problem.
- **Working Groups**: Once proposals are shortlisted and finalized, establish and fund small working groups, or project teams, to define and elaborate commitments, activities, and milestones. These groups could look beyond the OGFK and include government agencies who will implement the commitment, key civil society representatives working in the policy area, and crucially, citizens. This will ensure that the groups have a balance of technical and policy expertise, which in turn will result in representative, better designed, and more ambitious commitments.
- **Support & Resources**: In designing ambitious commitments, South Korea is encouraged to leverage opportunities for learning and peer-exchange. This may include approaching the OGP country support team and/or the IRM for guidance on experiences from other OGP members, or for support in creating tools and connections with experts in specific areas.

3. **Expand the scope and ambition of open data initiatives through stronger collaboration with citizens and civil society.**

Since 2013, South Korea has taken important steps toward increasing and improving data disclosure, including commitments about open data in successive OGP action plans. In the current plan, two commitments explicitly aim to expand the disclosure of high-quality public data and increase its use by citizens and businesses. Several other commitments reference efforts to increase data disclosure in specific sectors, including cultural heritage, tourism, food safety, and performance venues.

These ongoing efforts in public data disclosure position and reinforce South Korea as a regional and global leader in open data initiatives. According to the Open Data Barometer, South Korea is among the most improved governments for open data and data governance, having improved across all studied indicators over a five-year period.[10] Similarly, among signatories to the International Open Data Charter[11]—a set of best practices for publishing,

using, and maximizing the potential of data—South Korea is positioned within the top five global leaders in open government data.

Despite this position, the Barometer recognizes that true open data leadership entails making open data an integral part of governance. South Korea is presented with significant opportunity in this regard. Specifically, while the Barometer finds that South Korea has performed well in the areas of support for open data innovation and activity at the subnational level, it notes that there is more room for sustained collaboration between government and civil society in making open data useful for citizens, despite the operation of the national multistakeholder forum for open data, the Open Data Forum.

In light of this opportunity, the IRM finds that the current open data commitments are limited in scope and insufficiently reflect the country's ambition of global leadership in this area. This is largely because these commitments often stand to benefit and appeal to a specialized segment of society, or inadequately explain how, when taken together, the concomitant milestones and activities will address problems pertinent to society at large. There is, therefore, room to better ensure that governments publish data that people need and want. This will crucially enhance social impact.

In proposing recommendations in this regard, the IRM draws on international best practices, including recommendations from the Open Data Barometer, to encourage the following:

- **Engagement**: Engage citizens and civil society groups, beyond the open data and open government communities, to identify and prioritize datasets for publishing. This engagement may include online and offline public consultations; user-led design exercises; formal sector panels; and multistakeholder working groups.
- **Data Demand:** Develop clear procedures for assessing and segmenting data demand among citizens. These guidelines could include identifying data baselines; aligning data demand with citizen needs and priorities; defining and contextualizing key questions in problem areas; determining which stakeholders will benefit from open data; and assessing the readiness of the stakeholders to use the data to impact the policy area.[12]
- **Training and Capacity Building**: Conduct training programs on the use and value of open data; promote data literacy; and build capacity to execute open data strategies across all levels and categories of government officials. This will strengthen the government's ability to engage with citizens and civil society on open data, and better communicate related initiatives.
- **Data Intermediaries**: Engage and support data intermediaries from civil society to raise public awareness and disseminate data findings. These intermediaries are an important link between technical datasets and citizens, and help citizens maximize the potential of open data in their lives.[13]

In addition, the IRM reiterates that all commitments should have activities and milestones are specific and measurable, and clearly indicate what it aims to do and how it aims to do so (see Recommendation 2 above for more details).

4. Consolidate public participation in the budget process by reinforcing existing participatory platforms and mechanisms.

Several positive reforms, including new legislation and prior OGP commitments,[14] have disclosed budget data and improved participation, thereby improving South Korea's performance in the 2019 Open Budget Survey.[15] However, the International Budget Partnership (IBP) confirms that more can be done to consolidate budget participation in South Korea.[16]

Although South Korea introduced participatory budgeting and e-consultations during formation and implementation of the national budget, the IRM draws on IBP recommendations[17] to encourage a commitment with the following activities:

- Build on existing participatory platforms, such as CSO expert advisory committees, to facilitate more opportunities for citizen participation in the budget process.[18]
- Engage, inform, and consult vulnerable and underrepresented communities in forming and implementing the budget. This may include using offline communication and ensuring that consultations are easily accessible to all citizens.
- Introduce an explicit provision allowing any citizen or civil society organization to testify during public hearings at the national assembly relating to the legislature's approval of the annual budget or audit report.

5. Promote whistleblowing and combat corruption by strengthening public awareness of whistleblower protections and entitlements.

South Korea's Act on the Protection of Public Interest Whistleblowers (PPIWA) is widely considered one of the world's most comprehensive whistleblower laws.[19] The PPIWA addresses, for instance, protection for the recovery of status, reward and relief, personal confidentiality, and personal safety.[20] In 2017, amendments to the PPIWA shifted the burden of proof to the person or company subject to whistleblowing and required the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) to monitor whether those ordered to implement protective measures have done so.[21] As a result, the number of corruption and public interest whistleblowing cases both reported and processed increased in 2017 and 2018.[22]

However, the stigma attached to whistleblowing—fueled by a culture of organizational loyalty—continues to deter effective implementation of the law. Across government and large, family-owned industrial conglomerates, whistleblowers still face termination, financial sanction, and discrimination as a result of exposing corruption in their workplace.[23] This confirms a continuing need to translate legislative provisions into stronger whistleblower protection.

Recognizing this need, the IRM, in its 2016–2018 progress report on South Korea's third OGP action plan,[24] recommended the introduction of an ambitious commitment around strengthening whistleblower protection. However, such a commitment was not included in the fourth action plan. As South Korea endeavors to raise the ambition of its action plans and respond to domestic priorities, the IRM recommends that stakeholders, including the ACRC, consider introducing a commitment around whistleblower protection, including the following activities:

- **Awareness:** Raise public awareness about the protocol, protections, and incentives under the PPWIA in order to encourage reporting of corruption.
- **Case Studies:** Regularly publish and disseminate reports on whistleblower cases and their outcomes to highlight successful prosecutions and case studies, and encourage proactive whistleblowing.

Beyond raising awareness of protections and successful cases, additional measures may be needed to encourage whistleblowing in light of continued retribution and sanctions faced by whistleblowers. The IRM draws on Transparency International's Best Practice Guide for Whistleblowing Legislation[25] to recommend the following:

- **Legal Aid:** Ensure free access to legal aid for those seeking to report corruption. Promoting this access can raise awareness of formal channels for reporting and reassure whistleblowers of formal protection. While the ACRC is best positioned to

provide direct guidance for whistleblowers, this can also be provided by civil society, trade unions, and independent lawyers.

- **Internal Reporting Channels**: Require and incentivize public and private organizations to establish effective internal reporting mechanisms. This can be mandated through legislation, with civil penalties and sanctions for employers who do not comply by a given time period.[26] Other incentives could include holding the existence of mechanisms as a defense against corporate liability, or considering it a mitigating factor in imposing sanctions for corporate misconduct.[27]

Internal reporting mechanisms may include anonymous complaint boxes, designated email addresses, telephone hotlines, or in-person meetings, and must necessarily be accessible, reliable, and guarantee confidentiality.[28]

Table 5.1: Five Key Recommendations

1	Broaden and deepen public participation in the OGP process through proactive communication, wider consultations, and enhanced citizen engagement.
2	Design ambitious, relevant, and specific commitments in policy areas aligned with South Korea's OGP Steering Committee Co-Chair priorities.
3	Expand the scope and ambition of open data initiatives through stronger collaboration with citizens and civil society.
4	Consolidate public participation in the budget process by reinforcing existing participatory platforms and mechanisms.
5	Promote whistleblowing and combat corruption by strengthening public awareness of whistleblower protections and entitlements.

5.2 Response to Previous IRM Key Recommendations

Governments are required to respond to IRM key recommendations. This section provides an overview of how stakeholders addressed IRM recommendations and how the recommendations were incorporated into the next action plan process or its content.

Table 5.2: Previous IRM Report Key Recommendations

	Recommendation	Responded to?	Integrated into Current Action Plan?
1	Include highly specific, ambitious, and relevant commitments.	✔	✔
2	Improve cocreation during the development and implementation of the next action plan.	✔	✔
3	Leverage the OGP platform to advance ongoing reforms initiated by the Moon administration.	✔	✔
4	Develop strong commitments addressing conflict of interest and money in politics.	✔	X
5	Modernize existing open government policies and practices.	✔	✔

The government responded to all five IRM key recommendations in its self-assessment report on the third national action plan in 2018.[29] All but one of these recommendations were integrated into the current action plan.

1. **Recommendation One:** All commitments in South Korea's fourth action plan were specific enough to be verifiable and relevant to OGP values. The government's self-assessment report attributed this to the focus of the Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK) on ensuring that commitments were carefully selected and vetted before

inclusion in the action plan. Steps were also taken to consult OGP's Support Unit while designing the commitments. However, the lack of specificity in milestones and activities, and the failure to extend the scope of reforms into new policy areas, had a negative bearing on the assessment of potential impact and ambition of commitments.

2. **Recommendation Two:** The government's self-assessment report noted that the establishment and operation of the OGFK provided renewed momentum in developing and implementing the action plan. Through the OGFK, civil society generally played a key role throughout the cocreation process, although with little influence on the final selection of commitments. There was also limited participation by stakeholders outside the OGFK.

3. **Recommendation Three:** Several commitments in the fourth action plan advance reforms initiated under the Moon Jae-In administration. For example, operating the Gwanghwamoon First Street forum, establishing a public-private cooperative on anticorruption, and inspecting food safety in response to citizen requests, all emerge from President Moon's comprehensive plan for government innovation. However, according to the government's self-assessment, a general lack of awareness about OGP limits the potential for leveraging the OGP platform to advance these reforms.

4. **Recommendation Four:** Although the OGFK received commitment proposals from citizens on conflict of interest legislation, beneficial ownership transparency, lobbying, and political financing, these proposals were not included in the fourth action plan. The government's self-assessment notes that such proposals required "more comprehensive research and review from different perspectives" before they could be introduced as commitments.

5. **Recommendation Five:** A number of commitments (10 out of 13) included in the fourth action plan leverage technology and innovation to advance transparency and accountability. This reflects stakeholders' intent to modernize open government policies and practices. The government's self-assessment adds that it constantly seeks new approaches and discussions in this regard.

---

[1] OGP, *IRM Procedures Manual* (16 Sept. 2017), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

[2] Government of the Republic of Korea, *100 Policy Tasks: Five Year Plan of the Moon Jae-In Administration* (Korean Culture and Information Service, 17 Aug. 2017), http://www.korea.net/Resources/Publications/About-Korea/view?articleId=7959.

[3] Open Government Partnership, "OGP Steering Committee" (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/who-we-are/steering-committee/; Yujin Lee, "대한민국, OGP 제11대 의장국 선" [Republic of Korea elected the 11th chairman of the OGP] (Ministry of the Interior and Safety, 28 Aug. 2019), https://www.innogov.go.kr/ucms/bbs/B0000035/view.do?nttId=1810&menuNo=300106&pageIndex=1.

[4] Open Government Partnership, "OGP Participation & Co-Creation Standards" (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/ogp-participation-co-creation-standards/.

[5] *Id*.

[6] People's voice, a long-time existing online platform for citizen participation can be found here: https://www.vop.co.kr/index.html.

[7] Blue House, Presidential Office, "국민청" [Petition and Citizen Participation] (accessed Jul. 2020), https://www1.president.go.kr/petitions.

[8] Government of the Republic of Korea, "OGP Steering Committee Co-Chairmanship Priorities Note" (OGP, 18 Oct. 2019), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/SC_Co-Chairmanship-Priorities-Note_South-Korea_20191018.pdf.

[9] *Id*.

[10] World Wide Web Foundation, *Open Data Barometer - Leaders Edition: From Progress to Promise* (Sept. 2018), https://opendatabarometer.org/doc/leadersEdition/ODB-leadersEdition-Report.pdf.

[11] Open Data Charter (2015), https://opendatacharter.net/.

[12] Stefan Verhulst and Andrew Young, *Toward an Open Data Demand Assessment and Segmentation Methodology* (GOVLAB and AFD, accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.thegovlab.org/static/files/publications/Data+Demand.pdf.

[13] Stefan Verhulst and Andrew Young, *Open Data Impact: When Demand and Supply Meet* (GOVLAB and Omidyar Network, Mar. 2016), http://odimpact.org/key-findings.html.

[14] Jee In Chung, *Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017* (OGP, 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/South-Korea_Mid-Term_IRM-Report_2016-2018_EN.pdf.

[15] International Budget Partnership, *Open Budget Survey 2019* "South Korea" (2019), https://www.internationalbudget.org/sites/default/files/country-surveys-pdfs/2019/open-budget-survey-south-korea-2019-en.pdf.

[16] International Budget Partnership, *Open Budget Survey 2019* "South Korea" (2019), https://www.internationalbudget.org/sites/default/files/country-surveys-pdfs/2019/open-budget-survey-south-korea-2019-en.pdf.

[17] *Id*.

[18] Wonhee Lee, *New Challenges and Ambiguous Responses: An update on Korea* (Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency, Jun. 2015), http://www.fiscaltransparency.net/resourcesfiles/files/20150727121.pdf.

[19] Breaking the Silence, Strengths and Weaknesses in G20 Whistleblower Protection Laws, https://blueprintforfreespeech.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Breaking-the-SilenceStrengths-and-Weaknesses-in-G20-Whistleblower-Protection-Laws1.pdf

[20] Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission, "Anti-Corruption" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=020312.

[21] OECD, *Implementing the OECD Anti Bribery Convention, Phase 4 Report: Korea* (13 Dec. 2018), http://www.oecd.org/corruption/anti-bribery/OECD-Korea-Phase-4-Report-ENG.pdf.

[22] Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, "Protecting and Rewarding Whistleblowers" (accessed Jul. 2020), http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=02031607

[23] Choe Sang Hun, "South Korea's whistle-blowers sound off at their own risk" (*The New York Times*, 7 Nov. 2016), https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/09/business/international/south-korea-whistle-blower-corruption.html.

[24] Chung.

[25] Marie Terracol, *A Best Practice Guide for Whistleblowing Legislation* (Transparency International, 2018), https://images.transparencycdn.org/images/2018_GuideForWhistleblowingLegislation_EN.pdf.

[26] Thomson Reuters Foundation and Blueprint for Free Speech, *Protecting Whistleblowers in the UK: A New Blueprint* (27 Apr. 2016) 23, https://www.trust.org/publications/i/?id=7161e13d-2755-4e76-9ee7-fff02f6584db.

[27] *See* UK Ministry of Justice, *The Bribery Act of 2010 Guidance* (2011) 21, 29.

[28] Terracol, 34.

[29] Government of the Republic of Korea, *End-of-Term Self-Assessment Report on the 3rd National Action Plan (2016 - 2018)* (OGP, 2018), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/South-Korea_End-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf.

VI. Methodology and Sources

The IRM reports are written by researchers for each OGP-participating country or entity. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, observation, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholders. The IRM report builds on the evidence available in South Korea's OGP repository (or online tracker),[1] website, findings in the government's own self-assessment reports, and any other assessments of process and progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organizations. At the beginning of each reporting cycle, IRM staff share a research plan with governments to open a seven-day period of comments or feedback regarding the proposed research approach.

Each IRM researcher carries out stakeholder interviews to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested parties or visit implementation sites. Some contexts require anonymity of interviewees and the IRM reviews the right to remove personal identifying information of these participants. Due to the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary during the pre-publication review period of each report.

Each report undergoes a quality-control process that includes an internal review by IRM staff and the IRM's International Experts Panel (IEP). Each report also undergoes an external review where governments and civil society are invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual.[2]

Interviews and stakeholder input

The IRM obtained stakeholder views and input through a combination of in-person interviews, email communications, and online questionnaires. The IRM also engaged in extensive desk research into each policy area addressed by the commitments included in the action plan. To the extent available, government feedback was primarily facilitated by, or through, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety, while civil society input came from members of the Open Government Forum Korea (OGFK). The IRM researcher, based in South Korea, observed three OGFK meetings in 2019, where he shared some insight to inform this report. Throughout this process, stakeholders were offered anonymity and were informed that their feedback would be included in IRM reporting. Stakeholders were also reminded that translation facilities were available and responses to research questions could be provided in either Korean or English.

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) is a key means by which all stakeholders can track OGP progress in participating countries and entities. The International Experts Panel (IEP) oversees the quality control of each report. The IEP is comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

The current membership of the International Experts Panel is

- César Cruz-Rubio
- Mary Francoli
- Brendan Halloran
- Jeff Lovitt

- Fredline M'Cormack-Hale
- Showers Mawowa
- Juanita Olaya
- Quentin Reed
- Rick Snell
- Jean-Patrick Villeneuve

A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researchers. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org.

---

[1] South Korea's OGP repository is available at: https://www.innogov.go.kr.
[2] OGP, *IRM Procedures Manual* (16 Sept. 2017), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual.

Annex I. Overview of South Korea's performance throughout action plan development

Key:
Green= Meets standard
Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)
Red= No evidence of action

Multistakeholder Forum	
1a. Forum established: There is a forum to oversee the OGP process	**Green**
1b. Regularity: The forum meets at least every quarter, in person or remotely	Green
1c. Collaborative mandate development: Members of the forum jointly develop its remit, membership and governance structure	Green
1d. Mandate public: Information on the forum's remit, membership and governance structure is available on the OGP website/page	Green
2a. Multistakeholder: The forum includes both governmental and nongovernment representatives	**Green**
2b. Parity: The forum includes an even balance of governmental and nongovernmental representatives	Green
2c. Transparent selection: Nongovernmental members of the forum are selected through a fair and transparent process	**Green**
2d. High-level government representation: The forum includes high-level representatives with decision making authority from government	Green
3d. Openness: The forum accepts inputs and representation on the action plan process from any civil society or other stakeholders outside the forum	**Green**
3e. Remote participation: There are opportunities for remote participation in at least some meetings and events	Red
3f. Minutes: The OGP forum proactively communicates and reports back on its decisions, activities and results to wider government and civil society stakeholders	Green

Key:
Green= Meets standard
Yellow= In progress (steps have been taken to meet this standard, but standard is not met)
Red= No evidence of action

Action Plan Development	
4a. Process transparency: There is a national OGP website (or OGP webpage on a government website) where information on all aspects of the national OGP process is proactively published	Green
4b. Documentation in advance: The forum shares information about OGP to stakeholders in advance to guarantee they are informed and prepared to participate in all stages of the process	Green
4c. Awareness-raising: The forum conducts outreach and awareness raising activities with relevant stakeholders to inform them of the OGP process	Green
4d. Communication channels: The government facilitates direct communication with stakeholders to respond to action plan process questions, particularly during times of intense OGP activity	Green
4e. Reasoned response: The multistakeholder forum publishes its reasoning behind decisions and responds to major categories of public comment.	**Yellow**
5a. Repository: Government collects and publishes a document repository on the national OGP website/webpage, which provides a historical record and access to all documents related to the national OGP process, including (but not limited to) consultation documents, National Action Plans, government self-assessments, IRM reports and supporting documentation of commitment implementation (e.g., links to databases, evidence of meetings, publications)	**Green**

Editorial note: If a country "meets" the six standards in bold IRM will recognize the country's process as a Starred Process.